

Historic, archived document

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

Public Law 91-305

H. R. 17399

Sept. 27, 1970 House Committee on Education and the Labor Force reported H. R. 17399 with amendments.
 Oct. 1, 1970 H. R. 17399 was referred to the Subcommittee on Higher Education.
 Oct. 13, 1970 H. R. 17399 was referred to the Subcommittee on Higher Education.
 Nov. 2, 1970 House Committee on Education and the Labor Force reported H. R. 17399 with amendments.
 Nov. 13, 1970 H. R. 17399 was referred to the Subcommittee on Higher Education.
 Dec. 2, 1970 House Committee on Education and the Labor Force reported H. R. 17399 with amendments.
 Dec. 13, 1970 H. R. 17399 was referred to the Subcommittee on Higher Education.
 Jan. 2, 1971 House Committee on Education and the Labor Force reported H. R. 17399 with amendments.
 Jan. 13, 1971 H. R. 17399 was referred to the Subcommittee on Higher Education.
 Feb. 2, 1971 House Committee on Education and the Labor Force reported H. R. 17399 with amendments.
 Feb. 13, 1971 H. R. 17399 was referred to the Subcommittee on Higher Education.
 Mar. 2, 1971 House Committee on Education and the Labor Force reported H. R. 17399 with amendments.
 Mar. 13, 1971 H. R. 17399 was referred to the Subcommittee on Higher Education.
 Apr. 2, 1971 House Committee on Education and the Labor Force reported H. R. 17399 with amendments.
 Apr. 13, 1971 H. R. 17399 was referred to the Subcommittee on Higher Education.
 May 2, 1971 House Committee on Education and the Labor Force reported H. R. 17399 with amendments.
 May 13, 1971 H. R. 17399 was referred to the Subcommittee on Higher Education.
 Jun. 2, 1971 House Committee on Education and the Labor Force reported H. R. 17399 with amendments.
 Jun. 13, 1971 H. R. 17399 was referred to the Subcommittee on Higher Education.
 Jul. 2, 1971 House Committee on Education and the Labor Force reported H. R. 17399 with amendments.
 Jul. 13, 1971 H. R. 17399 was referred to the Subcommittee on Higher Education.
 Aug. 2, 1971 House Committee on Education and the Labor Force reported H. R. 17399 with amendments.
 Aug. 13, 1971 H. R. 17399 was referred to the Subcommittee on Higher Education.
 Sep. 2, 1971 House Committee on Education and the Labor Force reported H. R. 17399 with amendments.
 Sep. 13, 1971 H. R. 17399 was referred to the Subcommittee on Higher Education.
 Oct. 2, 1971 House Committee on Education and the Labor Force reported H. R. 17399 with amendments.
 Oct. 13, 1971 H. R. 17399 was referred to the Subcommittee on Higher Education.
 Nov. 2, 1971 House Committee on Education and the Labor Force reported H. R. 17399 with amendments.
 Nov. 13, 1971 H. R. 17399 was referred to the Subcommittee on Higher Education.
 Dec. 2, 1971 House Committee on Education and the Labor Force reported H. R. 17399 with amendments.
 Dec. 13, 1971 H. R. 17399 was referred to the Subcommittee on Higher Education.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Index and summary of H. R. 17399.....1

RECEIVED
JUL 11 1964
U.S. AIR FORCE

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

.....

INDEX AND SUMMARY OF H. R. 17399

- Apr. 30, 1970 House Appropriations Committee reported H. R. 17399. H. Rept. 91-1033. Print of bill and report, and table reflecting items for this Department.
- May 5, 1970 Rules Committee reported a resolution for consideration of H. R. 17399.
- May 7, 1970 House passed H. R. 17399 with amendments.
- May 11, 1970 H. R. 17399 was referred to Senate Appropriations Committee. Print of bill as referred.
- June 1, 1970 Senate subcommittee voted to report H. R. 17399.
- June 8, 1970 Senate committee voted to report H. R. 17399.
- June 9, 1970 Senate committee reported H. R. 17399 with amendments S. Rept. 91-917. Print of bill and report, table reflecting items of interest to this Department.
- June 22, 1970 Senate passed H. R. 17399 with amendments. Print of bill with Senate amendments numbered.
- Senate conferees were appointed.
- June 23, 1970 House conferees were appointed.
- June 24, 1970 House received conference report on H. R. 17399. H. Rept. 91-2227. Print of report.
- June 25, 1970 House agreed to conference report.
- June 29, 1970 Senate agreed to conference report.
- July 6, 1970 Approved. Public Law 91-305.

INDEX AND SUMMARY OF H. R. 13327

- Apr. 30, 1970 House Conference Committee reported H. R. 13327.
H. Rept. 91-1037. Print of bill and report, and
public relations items for this report.
- May 2, 1970 House Conference Committee reported a resolution for confere-
ence on H. R. 13327.
- May 7, 1970 House passed H. R. 13327 with amendments.
- May 11, 1970 H. R. 13327 was referred to House Transportation
Committee. Print of bill as referred.
- June 1, 1970 Senate subcommittee voted to report H. R. 13327.
- June 8, 1970 Senate committee voted to report H. R. 13327.
- June 9, 1970 Senate committee reported H. R. 13327 with amendments.
S. Rept. 91-VII. Print of bill and report, and
public relations items of interest to this committee.
- June 22, 1970 Senate passed H. R. 13327 with amendments. Print of
bill with Senate amendments prepared.
- Senate conference with committee.
- June 23, 1970 House conference was completed.
- June 24, 1970 House received conference report on H. R. 13327.
H. Rept. 91-1037. Print of report.
- June 25, 1970 House agreed to conference report.
- June 29, 1970 Senate agreed to conference report.
- July 6, 1970 Approved. Public Law 91-505.

April 30, 1970

17. LANDS. S. 3777, by Sen. Jackson, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to enter into contracts for the protection of public lands from fires, in advance of appropriations therefor, and to twice renew such contracts; to Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. Remarks of author pp. S6384-5
18. FAMILY ASSISTANCE. S. 3780, by Sen. McCarthy, to provide an adequate income for all Americans, to assure to every person a decent standard of living with dignity, justice, and democracy; to Finance Committee. Remarks of author p. S6386
19. SUBSIDY PAYMENTS. S. 3782, by Sen. Smith, Ill., to limit the amount which may be paid to any producer in any year under programs administered by the Department of Agriculture for wheat, feed grains, and upland cotton to \$20,000; to Agriculture and Forestry Committee.
20. POLLUTION. S. 3783, by Sen. Gore, "to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended; to Public Works Committee. Remarks of author pp. S6432-3
S. 3784, by Sen. Nelson, to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to protect the navigable waters of the United States from further pollution by requiring that pesticides manufactured for use in the U. S. or imported for use in the U. S. comply with certain standards of biodegradability and toxicity; to Public Works Committee.
21. CREDIT. H. R. 17366, by Rep. Griffin, to amend the Truth in Lending Act to eliminate the inclusion of agricultural credit; to Banking and Currency Committee.
22. PESTICIDES. H. R. 17391, by Rep. Udall, to prohibit the sale of shipment for use in the U. S. of certain chemical compounds; to Agriculture Committee.
23. PERSONNEL. H. R. 17373, to amend title 5, U. S. C., to provide special annuities for certain employees separated from the service as a result of reduction in force actions, closing or transfer of bases and other organizational units, and abolishment of positions; to Civil Service Committee.
24. REORGANIZATION. H. R. 17376, by Rep. Blatnik, to enact certain provisions of Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1970 (redesignation of the Bureau of the Budget as the Office of Management and Budget); to Gov't Operations Committee. Remarks of author p. H3772
H. Res. 960, by Rep. Blatnik, to disapprove Reorganization Plan No. 2; to Gov't Operations Committee. Remarks of author p. H3772

HOUSE, cont'd

25. APPROPRIATIONS. The Appropriations Committee reported H. R. 17399, the Second Supplemental Appropriation Bill, 1970 (H. Rept. No. 91-1033). p. H3787
House committee action on items proposed by the Department is shown on the table attached to this Digest. In addition the Bill provides the following:

- (a) An indefinite appropriation and transfer authority to meet the Fiscal Year 1970 costs of recent Federal Employees Salary Act;

(b) An upward adjustment in the statutory 1970 outlay ceiling;
and

(c) A Fiscal Year 1971 outlay control.

-0-

COMMITTEE HEARINGS ANNOUNCEMENTS:

MAY 1: Proposed Family Assistance Act, S. Finance (HEW Secretary Finch to testify).
Water pollution legislation, S. Public Works.

MAY 5: Tobacco marketing quotas, H. Agriculture (Turner and Todd, ASCS, to testify)

MAY 6: Wheat research and promotion, H. Agriculture (Weir and Freeman, ASCS, to
testify).

-oOo-

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

House Appropriations Committee action on the 1970
Second Supplemental Appropriations Bill

Agency	Budget Estimate	House Bill
Agricultural Research Service:		
Salaries and expenses	\$13,661,000:	\$13,500,000
Cooperative State Research Service	138,000:	130,000
Extension Service	a/ 847,000:	847,000
Farmer Cooperative Service	131,000:	131,000
Soil Conservation Service:		
Conservation operations	9,450,000:	9,450,000
Watershed planning	491,000:	491,000
River basin surveys and investigations	652,000:	652,000
Watershed works of improvement	2,159,000:	2,159,000
Flood prevention	815,000:	815,000
Great Plains conservation program	342,000:	342,000
Resource conservation and development	573,000:	573,000
Total, Soil Conservation Service	14,482,000:	14,482,000
Economic Research Service	1,142,000:	1,142,000
Statistical Reporting Service	1,116,000:	1,116,000
Consumer and Marketing Service - Consumer protective, marketing and regulatory programs	6,286,000:	5,250,000
Foreign Agricultural Service	630,000:	600,000
Commodity Exchange Authority	170,000:	170,000
Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service:		
Expenses ASCS:		
Direct appropriation	6,090,000:	6,000,000
Transfer from:		
Conservation reserve program	600,000:	600,000
CCC Fund	1,299,000:	1,299,000
Total, ASCS	7,989,000:	7,989,000
Federal Crop Insurance Corporation (payable from premium income)	691,000:	691,000
Rural Electrification Administration	1,075,000:	1,075,000
Farmers Home Administration	5,365,000:	5,200,000
Office of the Inspector General	1,022,000:	1,022,000
Packers and Stockyards Administration	154,000:	154,000
Office of the General Counsel	427,000:	427,000
Office of Information	150,000:	150,000
National Agricultural Library	175,000:	175,000
Office of Management Services	237,000:	237,000
General Administration	438,000:	425,000
Forest Service	b/31,266,000:	31,266,000
TOTAL, SUPPLEMENTAL REQUEST, USDA	87,592,000:	86,089,000

a/ Includes direct appropriation of \$250,000 for pay costs and authorization for transfer of \$597,000 from the appropriation "payments to States and Puerto Rico" for Federal contribution to the retirement fund for State extension personnel.

b/ Includes \$10,266,000 for pay costs and \$21,000,000 program supplemental for fighting forest fires.

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1970

APRIL 30, 1970.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

Mr. MAHON, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany H.R. 17399]

The Committee on Appropriations submits the following report in explanation of the accompanying bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes.

INDEX TO BILL AND REPORT

	Page Number	
	Bill	Report
Narrative summary of bill.....	XXXX	2
Tabular summary of bill.....	XXXX	4
Title I—General Supplementals:		
Chapter I—Agriculture.....	2	9
Chapter II—Defense.....	2	11
Chapter III—District of Columbia.....	3	14
Chapter IV—Foreign Operations.....	4	17
Chapter V—Independent Offices and Housing and Urban Development.....	4	19
Chapter VI—Interior.....	7	26
Chapter VII—Labor, and Health, Education and Welfare.....	9	30
Chapter VIII—Legislative.....	11	34
Chapter IX—Public Works.....	12	36
Chapter X—State, Justice, Commerce, and Judiciary.....	13	38
Chapter XI—Transportation.....	15	43
Chapter XII—Treasury, Post Office.....	16	45
Chapter XIII—Claims and Judgments.....	16	48
Title II—Increased Pay Costs.....	17	49
Title III—Increased Pay Costs—Federal Employees Salary Act of 1970.....	47	49
Title IV—Revised Ceiling on 1970 Outlays.....	51	92
Title V—Ceiling on 1971 Outlays.....	53	95
Title VI—General Provisions.....	56	XXXX

SUMMARY OF BILL

The bill funds various general program supplementals; pay increase costs due to comparability adjustments of last July; pay increase costs resulting from the recently enacted Federal Employees Salary Act of 1970 (the 6% retroactive pay bill); includes a revised ceiling on budget outlays for fiscal 1970; includes a proposed budget outlay ceiling for fiscal 1971; and includes a title involving the usual general provisions.

The estimates on which it is based are included in House Documents 91-272; 273; 288; 293; 306; 311; 315; and 322.

A brief discussion of the over-all bill totals follows. Details concerning the committee recommendations are covered in the various chapters and titles of this report, which are arranged in the order of the bill itself.

GRAND TOTAL OF BILL

The grand total of new budget (obligational) authority recommended in the bill is \$5,760,115,791, a reduction of \$157,957,340 from the \$5,918,073,131 requested.

In addition, title I includes proposed increases of \$75,000,000 in limitations on annual contract authorizations involving interest subsidies for homeownership and rental housing assistance and college housing.

The committee has also recommended transfers between appropriations amounting to \$49,384,900 and increases in limitations on administrative and nonadministrative expenses of trust funds amounting to \$45,334,700. Authorization to transfer between appropriation accounts has the effect of reducing the need for new budget (obligational) authority.

Excluding the \$1,350,000,000 for the recently enacted 6% retroactive pay increase, the total supplemental estimates considered by the Committee amount to less than the comparable aggregate figure encompassed in the overall total in the President's February budget for 1970 supplemental items, and the committee recommendation is still less than the amounts requested.

Nearly 90% of the new budget obligational authority total in the bill is for items that are virtually uncontrollable at this point. It includes \$1,350,000,000 for the Federal Employees Salary Act of 1970, which was generally effective as of December 27, 1969, and \$2,909,729,830 under title II for costs of comparability pay increases pursuant for the most part to PL 90-206 and PL 90-207 which were generally effective as of the beginning of the fiscal year last July 1st.

Just under \$800,000,000 is also included for mandatory payments under the following programs:

- Compensation payments and education and training for veterans,

- Public assistance grants,

- Payments to retired military personnel,

- Unemployment compensation for Federal employees and ex-servicemen, and

- Annual contributions for low-rent public housing.

In addition, \$75,000,000 is included for disaster relief assistance requirements, and \$6,591,406 for claims and judgments.

APPROXIMATE REDUCTION EFFECT ON 1970 BUDGETED OUTLAYS

The committee estimates that the reduction of \$157,957,340 in new budget (obligational) authority and its actions on requested transfers will have the effect of reducing budgeted outlays for 1970 by approximately \$123,300,000 from the amounts projected in the President's February budget.

TABULAR SUMMARY

The following table summarizes the revised budget requests and the amounts in the bill by titles and chapters:

**COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS
RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL**

SUMMARY

Report page No.	Chapter No.		Budget estimates	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with estimates
		TITLE I—GENERAL SUPPLEMENTALS			
9	I	Agriculture:			
		By transfer-----	(\$597, 000)	(\$597, 000)	-----
11	II	Defense:			
		New budget (obligational) authority-----	99, 000, 000	99, 000, 000	-----
14	III	District of Columbia:			
		Federal funds: New budget (obligational) authority-----	6, 170, 000	1, 293, 000	—\$4, 877, 000
		<i>District of Columbia funds:</i>			
		<i>New budget (obligational) authority-----</i>	(9, 755, 000)	(4, 078, 475)	(—5, 676, 525)
17	IV	Foreign Operations:			
		New budget (obligational) authority-----	205, 880, 000	205, 880, 000	-----
		<i>Limitation on administrative expenses-----</i>	(349, 000)	-----	(—349, 000)

19	V	Independent offices—Housing and Urban Development:			
		New budget (obligational) authority:			
		1969-----	13, 616, 000	13, 616, 000	-----
		1970-----	825, 711, 000	793, 110, 000	— 32, 601, 000
		Total-----	839, 327, 000	806, 726, 000	— 32, 601, 000
		<i>New annual contract authorizations, increase in limitations</i>	<i>(55, 500, 000)</i>	<i>(75, 000, 000)</i>	<i>(+ 19, 500, 000)</i>
26	VI	Interior: New budget (obligational) authority-----	55, 715, 000	55, 715, 000	-----
30	VII	Labor—Health, Education, and Welfare:			-----
		New budget (obligational) authority-----	204, 650, 000	204, 597, 000	— 53, 000
		<i>By transfer</i> -----	<i>(43, 000)</i>	<i>(43, 000)</i>	-----
		<i>Limitation on administrative expenses</i> -----	<i>(10, 000, 000)</i>	<i>(10, 000, 000)</i>	-----
34	VIII	Legislative branch-----	1, 131, 555	731, 555	— 400, 000
36	IX	Public Works (<i>By transfer</i>)-----	<i>(6, 563, 000)</i>	<i>(6, 563, 000)</i>	-----
38	X	State, Justice, Commerce, and Judiciary:			-----
		New budget (obligational) authority:			
		1969-----	300, 000	300, 000	-----
		1970-----	27, 281, 500	21, 330, 000	— 5, 951, 500
		Total-----	27, 581, 500	21, 630, 000	— 5, 951, 500
43	XI	Transportation: New budget (obligational) authority-----	84, 189, 000	84, 189, 000	-----

**COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS
RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL—Continued**

SUMMARY—Continued

Report page No.	Chapter No.		Budget estimates	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with estimates
		TITLE I—GENERAL SUPPLEMENTALS—Continued			
45	XII	Treasury-Post Office: New budget (obligational) authority--	\$14, 033, 000	\$14, 033, 000	-----
48	XIII	Claims and judgments-----	6, 591, 406	6, 591, 406	-----
		Total, title I—General supplementals:			-----
		New budget (obligational) authority:			-----
		1969-----	13, 916, 000	13, 916, 000	-----
		1970-----	1, 530, 352, 461	1, 486, 469, 961	-\$43, 882, 500
		Total-----	1, 544, 268, 461	1, 500, 385, 961	-43, 882, 500
		<i>New annual contract authorizations, increase in limitations</i> -----	(55, 500, 000)	(75, 000, 000)	(+19, 500, 000)
		<i>By transfer</i> -----	(7, 203, 000)	(7, 203, 000)	-----
		<i>Limitation on administrative expenses</i> -----	(10, 349, 000)	(10, 000, 000)	(-349, 000)

TITLES II AND III—INCREASED PAY COSTS

Title II, Regular Increased Pay Costs:

New budget (obligational) authority-----	3, 023, 804, 670	2, 909, 729, 830	- 114, 074, 840
<i>By transfer</i> -----	(42, 263, 000)	(42, 181, 900)	(- 81, 100)
<i>Limitations on administrative and nonadministrative expenses</i> -----	(36, 981, 000)	(35, 334, 700)	(- 1, 646, 300)
Title III, Pay Costs—Federal Employees Salary Act of 1970 (indefinite)-----	1 1, 350, 000, 000	1 1, 350, 000, 000	-----

Total, titles II and III, increased pay costs:

New budget (obligational) authority:

Definite-----	3, 023, 804, 670	2, 909, 729, 830	- 114, 074, 840
Indefinite-----	1 1, 350, 000, 000	1 1, 350, 000, 000	-----

Total-----

By transfer-----	4, 373, 804, 670	4, 259, 729, 830	- 114, 074, 840
<i>Limitations on administrative and nonadministrative expenses</i> -----	(42, 263, 000)	(42, 181, 900)	(- 81, 100)
	(36, 981, 000)	(35, 334, 700)	(- 1, 646, 300)

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL—Continued

SUMMARY—Continued

Report page No.	Chapter No.	Budget estimates	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with estimates
		RECAPITULATION		
		Grand total, titles I, II, and III:		
		New budget (obligational) authority:		
		1969-----	\$13, 916, 000	-----
		1970:		
		Definite-----	4, 396, 199, 791	—\$157, 957, 340
		Indefinite-----	¹ 1, 350, 000, 000	-----
		Total, 1970-----	5, 746, 199, 791	—157, 957, 340
		Total, new budget (obligational) authority-----	5, 760, 115, 791	—157, 957, 340
		New annual contract authorizations, increase in limita- tions-----	(75, 000, 000)	(+19, 500, 000)
		By transfer-----	(49, 384, 900)	(—81, 100)
		Limitations on administrative and nonadministrative ex- penses-----	(47, 330, 000)	(—1, 995, 300)

¹ Estimate of cost for the 6 months the 6 percent retroactive pay bill would be in effect during fiscal 1970. Under the bill language, transfers of certain unobligated balances are authorized to help meet the added costs, and some absorptions otherwise are probable. Thus, the aggregate additional appropriation under this provision may actually be less

than \$1,350,000,000. Note.—In terms of the February budget aggregates for 1970, the net additional estimated amount is \$1,175,000,000, after taking account of the \$175,000,000 allowance in the February budget total related to a postal pay raise.

TITLE I

CHAPTER I

SUBCOMMITTEE ON DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND RELATED AGENCIES

JAMIE L. WHITTEN, MISSISSIPPI, *Chairman*

WILLIAM H. NATCHER, KENTUCKY

ODIN LANGEN, MINNESOTA

W. R. HULL, JR., MISSOURI

ROBERT H. MICHEL, ILLINOIS

GEORGE E. SHIPLEY, ILLINOIS

MARK ANDREWS, NORTH DAKOTA

FRANK E. EVANS, COLORADO

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

EXTENSION SERVICE

COOPERATIVE EXTENSION WORK, PAYMENTS, AND EXPENSES

The Committee recommends the full budget estimate of \$597,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "payments to States and Puerto Rico", to meet the mandatory Federal contribution to the retirement fund for State extension personnel. This increase is related to the additional emphasis placed on promoting 4-H type programs in cities at the direction of this Committee, further pay comparability adjustments and the increase in the Federal contribution on agents' salaries authorized by P.L. 91-93.

**COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS
RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL**

TITLE I

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimates	Recommended in the bill	Bill compared with estimates
	CHAPTER I DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE EXTENSION SERVICE			
91-272	Cooperative Extension work, payments and expenses (<i>by transfer</i>) ---	(\$597, 000)	(\$597, 000)	-----

CHAPTER II

SUBCOMMITTEE ON DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

GEORGE H. MAHON, Texas, *Chairman*

ROBERT L. F. SIKES, FLORIDA	WILLIAM E. MINSHALL, OHIO
JAMIE L. WHITTEN, MISSISSIPPI	JOHN J. RHODES, ARIZONA
GEORGE W. ANDREWS, ALABAMA	GLENN R. DAVIS, WISCONSIN
DANIEL J. FLOOD, PENNSYLVANIA	LOUIS C. WYMAN, NEW HAMPSHIRE
JOHN M. SLACK, WEST VIRGINIA	
JOSEPH P. ADDABBO, NEW YORK	

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—MILITARY

The Committee recommends appropriations totaling \$99,000,000 for Retired Pay, Defense. The requirement for additional funds results from increased mandatory payments to retired personnel which are tied to increases in the consumer price index. No reductions were made in this request because the funds can only be used for the payment of retirement benefits and will lapse if not utilized by the end of the fiscal year. The resulting expenditures are estimated at \$99,000,000.

Under Title II of this bill, relating to increased pay costs, the Committee recommends appropriations totaling \$2,149,700,000, a reduction of \$102,271,000 below the request of \$2,251,971,000.

The total estimated cost to the Department of Defense, excluding Civil Defense, of the increase in pay and related costs effective July 1, 1969, for both military and civilian personnel was \$2,571,868,000. The Department was able to absorb \$319,897,000 through various internal actions and requests supplemental appropriation totaling \$2,251,971,000 as shown in the following table:

Purpose	Budget estimates	Recommended in the bill	Bill compared with estimates
Military pay.....	\$1,655,900,000	\$1,582,700,000	—\$73,200,000
Civilian pay.....	571,071,000	542,030,000	—29,071,000
Retired pay.....	25,000,000	25,000,000	
Total.....	2,251,971,000	2,149,700,000	—102,271,000

The recommended reductions of \$102,271,000 were made on the basis that the stated requirements were in excess of the actual needs of the services involved. For example, testimony before the Committee revealed that the services are all experiencing shortfalls in their planned military personnel end-strengths. In addition, troop withdrawals from Vietnam are proceeding ahead of the planned schedule. Both of these factors result in additional funds being made available.

Testimony before the Committee also revealed that both the Navy Reserve and the Air Force Reserve are experiencing shortfalls in their planned paid drill strengths. Because of the shortfalls, in planned drill strength, excess funds are available to be used to reduce the supplemental requirements.

The increased funds requested for civilian personnel are in the operation and maintenance accounts. Since operation and maintenance funds support military personnel, the requirements are directly affected by such items as the shortfalls in planned military personnel strength and the accelerated troop withdrawals from Vietnam. Therefore, to allow for the impact of these reductions in the operation and maintenance accounts, the Committee recommends a reduction of five percent of the supplemental request.

No reductions were applied to the request for \$25,000,000 for Retired Pay which is required to cover the increased cost of personnel who will be retiring from active duty during fiscal year 1970. As in the case of the \$99,000,000 discussed above, these funds can be used only for the payment of retirement benefits and will lapse if not utilized by the end of the fiscal year.

The resulting expenditure in Title II for military and civilian pay increases and related costs are estimated to be \$2,132,000,000.

**COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS
RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL**

TITLE I

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimates	Recommended in the bill	Bill compared with estimates
	CHAPTER II DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—MILITARY RETIRED MILITARY PERSONNEL			
91-272	Retired pay, Defense, new budget (obligational) authority-----	\$99, 000, 000	\$99, 000, 000	-----

CHAPTER III

SUBCOMMITTEE ON DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

WILLIAM H. NATCHER, *Kentucky, Chairman*

ROBERT N. GIAIMO, CONNECTICUT	GLENN R. DAVIS, WISCONSIN
EDWARD J. PATTEN, NEW JERSEY	DONALD W. RIEGLE, JR., MICHIGAN
DAVID PRYOR, ARKANSAS	WENDELL WYATT, OREGON
DAVID R. OBEY, WISCONSIN	

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The Committee recommends a total of \$1,293,000 in Federal funds and \$15,582,475 in District of Columbia funds. Of this latter amount, \$4,078,475 is in this chapter for operating programs and capital outlay, and \$11,504,000 is in title II to cover increased pay costs.

The budget proposed \$6,170,000 in Federal funds and \$21,259,000 in District of Columbia funds as submitted in House Documents Nos. 272 and 288. The recommended reduction in Federal funds is \$4,877,000 and \$5,676,525 in District funds.

FEDERAL FUNDS

The Committee is not recommending the additional \$4,877,000 requested Federal payment to the District of Columbia. District officials have recently reviewed the revenue estimates for the remainder of the current fiscal year and anticipate \$4,825,000 in revenues to the general fund over estimates of last fall. This additional revenue should be more than ample to finance the appropriations from the District Treasury recommended in the bill.

The Committee is recommending a loan appropriation of \$1,293,000 to finance the District's share of the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority subway construction program for the remainder of fiscal year 1970.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FUNDS

As noted above the Committee is recommending appropriations totaling \$15,582,475, of which \$4,078,475 is for operating programs and construction projects. The supplemental budget estimates totaled \$21,259,000, of which \$9,755,000 were for operating programs and construction. All new positions allowed are funded on a one-month basis rather than four months as requested.

General operating expenses.—The Committee has allowed \$2,675 and two positions to provide staff support for the Criminal Justice Coordinating Board and the Commissioner's Committee on Crime and Delinquency. The requests for an Assistant to the Commissioner for Criminal Justice Programs and supporting staff have been denied. The request for funds to rent space for the Court of General Sessions has been deferred pending enactment of the so-called District of Columbia crime bill.

Public safety.—The Committee has included \$2,370,500 for the Metropolitan Police Department. The entire request has been approved, but on a one-month funding basis rather than four months as requested. Included are 475 additional police officers which will bring the authorized strength of the department to 5100. The Committee has approved the organizational transfer of the Police and Fire Clinic from the Fire Department to the Police Department. A total of 44 additional civilian positions has been allowed including 18 to release officers currently performing non-police type functions. The bill includes \$750,000 for overtime during the month of June. Language is in the bill authorizing the Chief of Police to spend up to \$100,000 in confidential funds for the prevention and detection of crime in the city. This is an increase of \$65,000 over the current authorization.

Education.—The Committee is recommending 154 unfunded positions to enable the Federal City College and the Washington Technical Institute to proceed with the recruitment of academic staff for the fall semester commencing in September. Funds for these positions will be considered in connection with the regular appropriation bill for fiscal year 1971. This same procedure was used in fiscal year 1969. The Federal City College will receive 123 positions and the Washington Technical Institute will receive 31, as requested.

Parks and recreation.—The Committee recommends \$47,300 and 32 positions for the expansion of the roving leader program. The allowance provides one-month funding rather than four as proposed in the request.

Capital outlay.—The Committee recommends \$1,658,000 which includes \$1,293,000 for the District's share of the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority's 1970 subway construction program. It also includes \$365,000 for the "Carney block" street lighting program. This is a demonstration project under the crime prevention program. The Committee has deferred action on the two renovation projects related to the expansion of the D.C. Court system, pending enactment of court reorganization legislation.

Increased pay costs.—A total of \$11,504,000 is included in title II of the bill as requested. Details of overall costs, the amount of absorption of these costs by the various departments and agencies and additional funds required are included in the printed hearings on page 678.

**COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS
RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL**

16

TITLE I

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimates	Recommended in the bill	Bill compared with estimates
	CHAPTER III			
	DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA			
	FEDERAL FUNDS			
91-288	Federal payment to District of Columbia-----	\$4, 877, 000	-----	-\$4, 877, 000
91-272	Loans to the District of Columbia for capital outlay-----	1, 293, 000	\$1, 293, 000	-----
	Total, Federal funds-----	6, 170, 000	1, 293, 000	-4, 877, 000
	DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FUNDS			
91-288	General operating expenses-----	75, 000	2, 675	-72, 325
91-288	Public Safety-----	4, 712, 000	2, 370, 500	-2, 341, 500
91-288	Education-----	2, 500, 000	-----	-2, 500, 000
91-288	Parks and recreation-----	90, 000	47, 300	-42, 700
91-272 and 91-288	Capital outlay-----	2, 378, 000	1, 658, 000	-720, 000
	Total, District of Columbia funds-----	9, 755, 000	4, 078, 475	-5, 676, 525
	Total, Chapter III, new budget (obligational) authority-----	6, 170, 000	1, 293, 000	-4, 877, 000

CHAPTER IV

SUBCOMMITTEE ON FOREIGN OPERATIONS

OTTO E. PASSMAN, Louisiana, *Chairman*

JOHN J. ROONEY, NEW YORK
 JULIA BUTLER HANSEN, WASH-
 INGTON
 JEFFERY COHELAN, CALIFORNIA
 CLARENCE D. LONG, MARYLAND
 JOHN J. MCFALL, CALIFORNIA

GARNER E. SHRIVER, KANSAS
 SILVIO O. CONTE, MASSACHUSETTS
 CHARLOTTE T. REID, ILLINOIS
 DONALD W. RIEGLE, JR.,
 MICHIGAN

FOREIGN OPERATIONS

House Document No. 91-272, dated March 12, 1970, contained several supplemental estimates: \$205,880,000 for the second of two equal installments of the authorized United States contribution to the callable capital stock of the Inter-American Development Bank, \$349,000 for an increase in the administrative expense limitation of the Peace Corps to finance authorized increases in per diem travel expenses, and several other items dealing totally with pay cost increases which are contained in title II of the bill.

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL INSTITUTION

INVESTMENT IN INTER-AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK

The Committee recommends the full amount of the request of \$205,880,000. These additional funds are needed to enable the Bank to sustain a recently increased rate of lending operations.

PEACE CORPS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

The Committee has disallowed the full budget request of the \$349,000 increase in administrative expense limitation.

**COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS
RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL**

TITLE I

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimates	Recommended in the bill	Bill compared with estimates
	CHAPTER IV			
	FOREIGN OPERATIONS			
	FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT			
91-272	Investment in Inter-American Development Bank-----	\$205, 880, 000	\$205, 880, 000	-----
91-272	Peace Corps (<i>Increase in limitation</i>)-----	(349, 000)	-----	(-\$349, 000)
	Total, Chapter IV, new budget (obligational) authority-----	205, 880, 000	205, 880, 000	-----

CHAPTER V

SUBCOMMITTEE ON INDEPENDENT OFFICES AND DEPARTMENT OF
HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENTJOE L. EVINS, *Tennessee, Chairman*EDWARD P. BOLAND, MASSACHU-
SETTS

GEORGE E. SHIPLEY, ILLINOIS

ROBERT N. GIAIMO, CONNECTICUT

JOHN O. MARSH, JR., VIRGINIA

DAVID PRYOR, ARKANSAS

CHARLES R. JONAS, NORTH CAROLINA

BURT L. TALCOTT, CALIFORNIA

JOSEPH M. McDADE, PENNSYLVANIA

DEL CLAWSON, CALIFORNIA

INDEPENDENT OFFICES

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

The Committee has approved language proposed in the budget estimate to authorize compensation of public members of the Federal Service Impasses Panel at the per diem rate of a grade GS-18 employee. The current rate is \$100 per day, and the higher rate is required to obtain the highest qualified individuals for mediation of disputes relating to Federal employment.

COMMISSION ON POPULATION GROWTH AND THE AMERICAN FUTURE

An appropriation of \$965,000 is recommended for salaries and expenses of this Commission. Its mission is to inquire into and make recommendations on the probable course of population growth in the United States between now and the year 2000, the resources required to deal with the anticipated growth, and the ways in which population growth may affect the activities of federal, state, and local governments. The budget submitted to the Committee provided funding for this supplemental and advance funding for 1971 and 1972. The Committee has approved the amount indicated covering the supplemental and 1971. The sum of \$468,000 is not recommended at this time.

The Committee believes that the findings and recommendations of this Commission can be highly significant and useful, but that best results will be obtained only if pursued on the basis of a sound program and financial plan. This is not presently available. The amount recommended will provide adequate funds for the Commission to develop its plans, and provides that the program funds will become available when the plan is submitted to the Congress.

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

An appropriation of \$7,000,000 is recommended for administering the Selective Service System. The request for additional funds includes \$2,152,000 for selectee travel, and \$5,281,000 to finance civilian and military pay increases provided by basic legislation. The amount recommended by the Committee is \$433,000 less than the budget estimate.

VETERANS ADMINISTRATION

COMPENSATION AND PENSIONS

The Committee recommends the supplemental request of \$273,000,-000 for compensation and pensions. This includes \$237,000,000 due to an increased number of cases and higher average payments than had been anticipated, and \$36,000,000 for dependency and indemnity compensation rate increases for widows and children, and special allowances for widows in need of regular aid and attendance authorized by Public Law 91-96, effective December 1, 1969.

READJUSTMENT BENEFITS

An appropriation of \$327,500,000 is recommended for readjustment benefits to meet increased requirements for the balance of the fiscal year. This includes \$132,400,000 for higher benefit rates authorized by the Veterans Education and Training Amendments Act of 1970, which raised education and training assistance allowances approximately 35 percent retroactively to February 1, 1970. It also includes \$192,800,000 for an estimated 354,000 increase in trainees over the number originally estimated. It is now estimated that 1,409,000 veterans will receive education and training benefits during the current fiscal year.

MEDICAL CARE

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$109,500,000 for increased medical and hospital care programs. This is an increase of \$3,000,000 over the budget estimate of \$106,500,000. The total includes \$91,500,000 for civilian pay act and wage board increases, and \$18,000,000 for outpatient dental care and treatment to additional veterans, new and additional equipment for patient care in hospitals, and to further upgrade medical care and services to an increasing number of eligible veterans.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

The Committee considered a request of \$300,000 for newly created programs and services of the Council on Environmental Quality, which was established by Public Law 91-190, approved January 1, 1970. The Council is given the responsibility of appraising and coordinating our national efforts in the improvement of environmental quality.

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$100,000, which is in addition to the \$200,000 already advanced to the Council from the Emergency fund for the President to initiate its studies. The Committee does not consider it necessary to reimburse the emergency fund at this time due to the lateness in the fiscal year.

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

DISASTER RELIEF

The Committee considered a request for an additional \$100,000,000 for disaster relief assistance, and recommends an appropriation of \$75,000,000. This is in addition to \$170,000,000 previously provided for the current fiscal year.

The additional funds are primarily for new types of disaster assistance authorized by Public Law 91-79, enacted on October 1, 1969. The largest costs under the new law are for unemployment compensation to individuals who are unemployed as a result of a major disaster. With the current balance of about \$34,000,000, the funds provided should be adequate for normal demands in the balance of the fiscal year.

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

RENEWAL AND HOUSING ASSISTANCE

LOW RENT PUBLIC HOUSING ANNUAL CONTRIBUTIONS

The budget estimates include a supplemental amount of \$13,616,000 for annual contributions payments on low-rent public housing programs for the fiscal year 1969, and \$6,500,000 for payments in the fiscal year 1970. The Committee recommends the full amount requested for 1969 since it represents the balance required to fund all audited contracts for payments for that year, but does not recommend the 1970 supplemental as firm figures are not yet available.

Amendments contained in the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1969 expand the liability of the Federal government to authorize payments in excess of debt service to local housing authorities when necessary to insure the low-rent character of a project, and also provide that a rental charge may not exceed one-fourth of a tenant's income. With economical and efficient administration by local authorities, and a careful audit of project costs, the Committee believes the \$473,500,000 provided previously for 1970 should cover the immediate program requirements, including the provisions of the new law.

COLLEGE HOUSING

The program level approved by Congress for college housing loans is \$300,000,000 for the current fiscal year. These loans were funded by borrowings from the Treasury prior to the enactment of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968, but now are financed primarily by loans in the private market with the assistance of contracts for annual payment of debt service.

The prior contract authorization of \$6,500,000 for 1970 for college housing loan debt service grants was based on rates of interest substantially below prevailing interest rates, and the amount is insufficient to support the number and level of loans contemplated at the beginning of the year. An increase of \$5,000,000 in annual contract authority is therefore recommended by the Committee at this time.

This is \$500,000 less than the budget estimate. The Committee is of the opinion that this reduction can be made in the budget request inasmuch as some loans will continue to require Treasury financing.

MORTGAGE CREDIT

HOMEOWNERSHIP AND RENTAL HOUSING ASSISTANCE

The budget estimates propose to increase the annual contract authorizations for the homeownership assistance program (sec. 235) and the rental housing assistance program (sec. 236) by \$50,000,000—\$25,000,000 each. The annual contract authority available in 1970 for these programs is presently \$90,000,000 and \$85,000,000, respectively. The Committee recommends \$35,000,000 for each program, or \$10,000,000 more for both the 235 and 236 programs than the supplemental budget estimates.

The amounts provided will serve to maintain the momentum that has been established in providing housing for low-income families through these programs in the current fiscal year. Testimony received by the Committee indicates that these programs have been a major factor in keeping the housing industry alive today. The housing industry has been injured by the current financial crunch and the assistance provided by these programs is especially valuable and needed at this time.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS
RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL

TITLE I

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimates	Recommended in the bill	Bill compared with estimates
	CHAPTER V INDEPENDENT OFFICES CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION			
91-306	Federal Labor Relations Council: Salaries and expenses	Language	Language	-----
91-273	COMMISSION ON POPULATION GROWTH AND THE AMERICAN FUTURE Salaries and expenses	1, 433, 000	965, 000	— 468, 000
91-272	SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM Salaries and expenses	7, 433, 000	7, 000, 000	— 433, 000
91-272	VETERANS ADMINISTRATION Compensation and pensions	273, 045, 000	273, 045, 000	-----
91-272 91-312	Readjustment benefits	330, 500, 000	327, 500, 000	— 3, 000, 000
91-272 91-293	Medical care	106, 500, 000	109, 500, 000	+ 3, 000, 000
	Total, Veterans Administration	710, 045, 000	710, 045, 000	-----

**COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS
RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL—Continued**

TITLE—Continued

Report page No.		Budget estimates	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with estimates
	CHAPTER V—Continued			
	EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT			
	COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY			
91-272	Salaries and expenses-----	\$300, 000	\$100, 000	—\$200, 000
	FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT			
91-272	Disaster Relief-----	100, 000, 000	75, 000, 000	—25, 000, 000
	DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT			
	RENEWAL AND HOUSING ASSISTANCE			
91-272	Low rent public housing annual contributions:			
	1969-----	13, 616, 000	13, 616, 000	-----
	1970-----	6, 500, 000	-----	—6, 500, 000
91-272	College Housing (annual contract authorization, increase in limitation)-----	(5, 500, 000)	(5, 000, 000)	(—500, 000)

91-273	MORTGAGE CREDIT			
	<i>Homeownership and rental housing assistance (annual contract authorizations, increase in limitation):</i>			
	<i>Homeownership assistance</i>	(25, 000, 000) (25, 000, 000)	(35, 000, 000) (35, 000, 000)	(+10, 000, 000) (+10, 000, 000)
	<i>Rental housing assistance</i>			
	Total, Department of Housing and Urban Development:			
	1969	13, 616, 000	13, 616, 000	-----
	1970	6, 500, 000	-----	-6, 500, 000
	Total	20, 116, 000	13, 616, 000	-6, 500, 000
	<i>New annual contract authorization, increase in limitation</i>	(55, 500, 000)	(75, 000, 000)	(+19, 500, 000)
	Total, chapter V:			
	New budget (obligational) authority:			
	1969	13, 616, 000	13, 616, 000	-----
	1970	825, 711, 000	793, 110, 000	-32, 601, 000
	Total	839, 327, 000	806, 726, 000	-32, 601, 000
	<i>New annual contract authorization, increase in limitation</i>	(55, 500, 000)	(75, 000, 000)	(+19, 500, 000)

CHAPTER VI

SUBCOMMITTEE ON DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES

JULIA BUTLER HANSEN, Washington, *Chairman*

MICHAEL J. KIRWAN, Ohio
 JOHN O. MARSH, JR., Virginia
 JOHN J. FLYNT, JR., Georgia
 DAVID R. OBEY, Wisconsin

BEN REIFEL, South Dakota
 JOSEPH M. McDADE, Pennsylvania
 WENDELL WYATT, Oregon

The Committee recommends total appropriations of \$55,715,000, the budget estimate, for activities of the seven agencies included in this chapter. Of the total amount requested in the budget estimate for this chapter, \$46,340,000 is for forest fire suppression costs, and \$7,100,000 is for the emergency acquisition of land for the Point Reyes National Seashore, California.

In title II of the bill, the Committee has recommended total reductions of \$500,000 below the budget estimates of \$54,043,000 for increased pay costs of the various agencies funded in the Department of Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT OF LANDS AND RESOURCES

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$23,790,000, the budget estimate, to provide for the costs of suppression and emergency prevention of fires on or threatening forest range lands of the Bureau of Land Management, and for the emergency rehabilitation of those lands to prevent further damage from weather conditions.

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

RESOURCES MANAGEMENT

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$700,000, the budget estimate, to provide for the costs of suppression and emergency prevention of fires on or threatening forest range lands of Indian reservations and the emergency rehabilitation of those lands to prevent further damage from weather conditions.

BUREAU OF OUTDOOR RECREATION

LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$7,100,000, the budget estimate, to enable further acquisitions of land for the Point Reyes National Seashore, California. Funds for this purpose are urgently needed in view of the fact that a portion of the authorized seashore area has already been subdivided for private purposes, and potential subdivisions which would be within the boundaries are under consideration.

OFFICE OF TERRITORIES

ADMINISTRATION OF TERRITORIES

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$275,000, the budget estimate, to provide for completion of an electrical power project and consolidation of office space to improve the efficiency of administrative activities in American Samoa.

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

MANAGEMENT AND PROTECTION

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$850,000, the budget estimate, to provide for the costs of suppression and emergency prevention of fires on or threatening forest range lands of the National Park Service, and for the emergency rehabilitation of those lands to prevent further damage from weather conditions.

RELATED AGENCIES

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

FOREST SERVICE

FOREST PROTECTION AND UTILIZATION

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$21,000,000, the budget estimate, for current and anticipated expenses of fighting fires in national forests.

NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$2,000,000, the budget estimate, to provide up to \$2,000,000 of Federal funds to match private gifts made to the Foundation.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS
RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL

TITLE I

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimates	Recommended in the bill	Bill compared with estimates
	CHAPTER VI			
	DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR			
	PUBLIC LAND MANAGEMENT			
	BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT			
91-272	Management of lands and resources-----	\$23, 790, 000	\$23, 790, 000	-----
	BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS			
	Resources management-----	700, 000	700, 000	-----
91-272	BUREAU OF OUTDOOR RECREATION			
	Land and water conservation-----	7, 100, 000	7, 100, 000	-----

91-272	OFFICE OF TERRITORIES Administration of territories-----	275, 000	275, 000	-----
	FISH AND WILDLIFE, PARKS, AND MARINE RESOURCES NATIONAL PARK SERVICE			
91-272	Management and protection-----	850, 000	850, 000	-----
	RELATED AGENCIES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE FOREST SERVICE			
91-272	FOREST PROTECTION AND UTILIZATION-----	21, 000, 000	21, 000, 000	-----
	NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES Salaries and expenses-----	2, 000, 000	2, 000, 000	-----
91-272	Total, chapter VI, new budget (obligational) authority-----	55, 715, 000	55, 715, 000	-----

CHAPTER VII

SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, AND HEALTH,
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, AND RELATED AGENCIESDANIEL J. FLOOD, Pennsylvania, *Chairman*

WILLIAM H. NATCHER, Kentucky	ROBERT H. MICHEL, Illinois
NEAL SMITH, Iowa	GARNER E. SHRIVER, Kansas
W. R. HULL, Jr., Missouri	CHARLOTTE T. REID, Illinois
BOB CASEY, Texas	

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

BUREAU OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEES AND
EX-SERVICEMEN

The bill includes \$50,000,000 the amount of the request, most of which is needed because of the increased separations from the armed forces. At the time of the hearings the latest Department of Defense plans were to increase the number of separations during fiscal year 1970 by 158,000 over the original plan which called for 942,000.

LIMITATION ON GRANTS TO STATES FOR UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION
AND EMPLOYMENT SERVICE ADMINISTRATION

The bill includes the requested amount of \$10,000,000 to provide for increased administrative costs for processing unemployment insurance workloads resulting from recent increases in the number of unemployment claims. On the basis of current statistics it appears that insured unemployment will average at least 1,860,000 per week for the balance of the fiscal year, bringing the fiscal year average to 1,300,000 compared with an average of 1,150,000 estimated in the original 1970 budget.

WAGE AND LABOR STANDARDS ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

In accordance with the request the bill includes authority to transfer \$43,000 from this appropriation to the Longshoremen's and Harbor-workers' Compensation Act trust fund, and an appropriation of \$37,000. The remaining \$6,000 will be transferred from funds previously appropriated. In the absence of this appropriation payments known to be due under the Act cannot be paid.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

FEDERAL CONTRACT COMPLIANCE AND CIVIL RIGHTS PROGRAM

The bill includes \$107,000, a reduction of \$53,000 from the request to permit the Office of Federal Contract Compliance to develop a planning, policies and procedures staff to establish an effective and

coordinated equal employment compliance program for Federal agencies with compliance responsibilities under Executive Order 11246. The Committee agrees with the need for some additional employees for this purpose, but believes a good job can be done with fewer than the 26 requested. The amount in the bill will provide for 17.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

SOCIAL AND REHABILITATION SERVICE

GRANTS TO STATES FOR PUBLIC ASSISTANCE

The bill includes \$146,753,000, the amount of the request. At the time the Department submitted the fiscal year 1970 budget request, the Committee was told that a supplemental appropriation of \$322,000,000 would likely be required if the Aid to Families with Dependent Children "freeze" provision were repealed. This provision was repealed, however, the estimate proved to be somewhat high, and requirements for the adult categories of assistance proved to be less than originally estimated, further reducing the requirement for supplemental funds.

HOWARD UNIVERSITY

CONSTRUCTION

The bill includes \$7,700,000, the amount of the request, which will bring to \$29,900,000 the total available for the construction of a 500-bed teaching hospital for the University. There is no doubt as to the necessity of this hospital, which will replace Freedmen's Hospital, and it appears that the current cost estimate is reasonable. It is in line with the current costs for similar hospitals. Obviously, the estimate the Committee received last year was not realistic.

**COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS
RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL**

TITLE I

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimates	Recommended in the bill	Bill compared with estimates
	CHAPTER VII			
	DEPARTMENT OF LABOR			
	BUREAU OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY			
91-272	Unemployment compensation for Federal employees and ex-service- men-----	\$50, 000, 000	\$50, 000, 000	-----
91-272	<i>Limitation on grants to States for unemployment compensation and em- ployment service administration</i> -----	(10, 000, 000)	(10, 000, 000)	-----
	WAGE AND LABOR STANDARDS ADMINISTRATION			
91-272	Salaries and expenses-----	37, 000	37, 000	-----
	Longshoremen's and harbor workers compensation fund (<i>by transfer</i>)-----	(43, 000)	(43, 000)	-----
	OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY			
91-272	Federal contract compliance and civil rights program, salaries and expenses-----	160, 000	107, 000	-\$53, 000
	Total, Department of Labor-----	50, 197, 000	50, 144, 000	-53, 000
	<i>By transfer</i> -----	(43, 000)	(43, 000)	-----
	<i>Limitation (trust fund)</i> -----	(10, 000, 000)	(10, 000, 000)	-----

CHAPTER VIII

SUBCOMMITTEE ON LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

GEORGE W. ANDREWS, Alabama, *Chairman*

MICHAEL J. KIRWAN, OHIO

SIDNEY R. YATES, ILLINOIS

BOB CASEY, TEXAS

FRANK E. EVANS, COLORADO

FRANK T. BOW, OHIO

ODIN LANGEN, MINNESOTA

BEN REIFEL, SOUTH DAKOTA

DEL CLAWSON, CALIFORNIA

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

The Committee recommends a total of \$11,985,485 which includes \$731,555 in this chapter and \$11,253,930 in title II of the bill for increased pay costs. The supplemental requests submitted in House Documents Nos. 272 and 306 total \$13,375,525. The over-all reduction is \$1,390,040.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The allowance of \$232,555 includes \$47,000 to cover the increase in retirement contributions for Members from 7½% to 8% effective January 1, 1970, and \$35,555 for the Committee on Appropriations (investigations).

Also included is \$50,000 to cover anticipated losses in the operation of the House Restaurant facilities during the remainder of the current fiscal year. A total deficit of \$248,000 is currently estimated for 1970. The regular bill for 1970 provided \$159,000. This amount plus a carryover of \$39,000 from the previous year provides \$198,000 to date. Wage increases granted during the current year total approximately \$50,000.

The Committee has reduced the request for "Special and Select Committees" from \$500,000 to \$100,000. These funds are to reimburse the contingent fund for expenditures made or authorized pursuant to House Resolution 710, approved November 25, 1969. This resolution authorized the House Administration Committee "to incur such additional expenses (not in excess of \$500,000) as it deems advisable in carrying out its duties, including the development of a computer system for the House of Representatives".

GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

The Committee has included the \$499,000 requested by the Comptroller General to cover the cost of increased travel per diem allowances authorized by Public Law 91-114, approved November 10, 1969.

INCREASED PAY COSTS

The Committee has made a number of downward adjustments in the increased pay costs estimates in title II of the bill. These estimates, excluding items relating solely to the Senate, totaled \$12,243,970 as submitted. The recommendations total \$11,253,930. The various departments, agencies and other activities reviewed their projections recently and were able to come up with these lesser requirements. Conforming to long practice, funds exclusively for operations and activities of the Senate, including items jurisdictionally under the Architect of the Capitol, are left for decision and insertion by that body.

**COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS
RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL**

TITLE I

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimates	Recommended in the bill	Bill compared with estimates
	CHAPTER VIII			
	LEGISLATIVE BRANCH			
	HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES			
	SALARIES, MILEAGE FOR THE MEMBERS, AND EXPENSE ALLOWANCE OF THE SPEAKER.			
91-272	Compensation of Members-----	\$47, 000	\$47, 000	-----
	SALARIES, OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES			
91-306	Committee on Appropriations (investigations)-----	35, 555	35, 555	-----
	CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE HOUSE			
91-306	Miscellaneous items-----	50, 000	50, 000	-----
91-272	Special and select committees-----	500, 000	100, 000	-\$400, 000
	Total, House of Representatives-----	632, 555	232, 555	-400, 000
	GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE			
	SALARIES AND EXPENSES-----	499, 000	499, 000	-----
91-272	Total, chapter VIII, new budget (obligational) authority-----	1, 131, 555	731, 555	-400, 000

CHAPTER IX

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

MICHAEL J. KIRWAN, Ohio, *Chairman*

JOE L. EVINS, TENNESSEE

EDWARD P. BOLAND, MASSA-
CHUSETTS

JAMIE L. WHITTEN, MISSISSIPPI

GEORGE W. ANDREWS, ALABAMA

JOHN J. RHODES, ARIZONA

GLENN R. DAVIS, WISCONSIN

HOWARD W. ROBISON, NEW YORK

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

COLORADO RIVER BASIN PROJECT

The Committee recommends the budget estimate of \$6,563,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation "Construction and Rehabilitation", to cover the Federal Government's share of contractor's earnings under the Navajo Project Participating Agreement. The additional requirement results from an advance in the construction schedule to assure commercial operation of the thermal electric generating plant by June, 1974.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS
RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL
TITLE I

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimates	Recommended in the bill	Bill compared with estimates
	CHAPTER IX DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR BUREAU OF RECLAMATION			
306	Colorado River Basin Project (<i>By transfer</i>)-----	(\$6, 563, 000)	(\$6, 563, 000)	-----

CHAPTER X

SUBCOMMITTEE ON DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, AND COMMERCE,
THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES**JOHN J. ROONEY, New York, *Chairman*****ROBERT L. F. SIKES, FLORIDA****JOHN M. SLACK, WEST****VIRGINIA****NEAL SMITH, IOWA****JOHN J. FLYNT, JR., GEORGIA****FRANK T. BOW, OHIO****ELFORD A. CEDERBERG,****MICHIGAN****MARK ANDREWS, NORTH DAKOTA**

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

CONTRIBUTIONS TO INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

There is included in the bill the sum of \$1,600,000, a reduction of \$200,000 in the amount of the budget estimate, to enable the United States to contribute its share of the cost of converting the North Atlantic Treaty Organizations headquarters facility at Evere, Belgium to permanent quarters.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

The additional sum of \$892,000, the full amount of the request, is provided for unanticipated costs of transporting, detaining, and expelling illegal aliens.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

NINETEENTH DECENNIAL CENSUS

An additional \$11,000,000 is provided for the Nineteenth decennial census for completing the field data collection. Any of the funds which are not used for that purpose will remain available to cover other costs of the census.

OFFICE OF FIELD SERVICES

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Also included in the bill is the sum of \$105,000 to provide for improvement of the quality of the Commerce Business Daily. The increased costs are to be offset by an increase in the subscription price of the publication from \$15 to \$25 per year.

THE JUDICIARY

CUSTOMS COURT

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

The additional sum of \$18,000 is provided for "Salaries and Expenses" of the United States Customs Court. This additional amount is to cover increased travel costs.

COURTS OF APPEALS, DISTRICT COURTS AND OTHER JUDICIAL SERVICES

SALARIES OF SUPPORTING PERSONNEL

The request for \$145,000 to provide grade increases for certain positions effective April 1, 1970 has not been allowed but will be considered in the regular annual appropriation bill.

FEES AND EXPENSES OF COURT-APPOINTED COUNSEL

The sum of \$1,150,000 for the fiscal year 1970, as well as the sum of \$300,000 additional for fiscal year 1969, the full amounts of the budget estimates, are included in the bill to liquidate obligations incurred under the Criminal Justice Act of 1964.

FEES OF JURORS AND COMMISSIONERS

The Committee recommends a total of \$500,000 additional for fees and allowances of jurors. This is a reduction of \$300,000 in the amount of the request.

TRAVEL AND MISCELLANEOUS EXPENSES

The additional sum of \$500,000 is provided for travel and miscellaneous expenses of the judges and the supporting personnel of the United States courts of appeals and United States district courts. The amount allowed is a reduction of \$125,000 in the amount of the request.

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES

The Committee recommends an additional \$15,000, which is \$35,000 less than the amount requested, for this item. The additional funds are for increased travel costs.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, UNITED STATES MAGISTRATES

The sum of \$550,000 is provided to finance a pilot program under the Federal Magistrate Act, P.L. 90-578, approved October 17, 1968. The Act provides for a system of full-time and part-time Federal magistrates to replace the existing system of United States commissioners.

EXPENSES OF REFEREES

The requested sum of \$34,000 additional for travel costs has been denied.

RELATED AGENCIES

OFFICE OF EDUCATION

CIVIL RIGHTS EDUCATION

The additional sum of \$5,000,000 is included in the bill to provide additional support for activities carried out under Title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which authorizes aid to local jurisdictions in planning and implementing the desegregation of public schools.

SPECIAL REPRESENTATIVE FOR TRADE NEGOTIATIONS

The request in the amount \$60,000 to provide for new professional and support staff and for additional travel expenses has been denied.

**COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS
RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL
TITLE I**

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimates	Recommended in the bill	Bill compared with estimates
	CHAPTER X			
	DEPARTMENT OF STATE			
91-272	Contributions to international organizations-----	\$1, 800, 000	\$1, 600, 000	--\$200, 000
	DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE			
91-272	Immigration and Naturalization Service: Salaries and expenses-----	\$92, 000	892, 000	
	DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE			
	BUREAU OF THE CENSUS			
91-272	Nineteenth decennial census-----	11, 000, 000	11, 000, 000	
	OFFICE OF FIELD SERVICES			
	Salaries and expenses-----	105, 000	105, 000	
91-272	Total, Department of Commerce-----	11, 105, 000	11, 105, 000	
	THE JUDICIARY			
	CUSTOMS COURT			
91-272	Salaries and expenses-----	\$60, 500	18, 000	--42, 500

COURTS OF APPEALS, DISTRICT COURTS, AND OTHER
JUDICIAL SERVICES

91-272	Salaries and expenses, United States magistrates-----	560, 000	550, 000	- 10, 000
91-272	Salaries of supporting personnel-----	145, 000	-----	- 145, 000
91-272	Fees and expenses of court-appointed counsel: 1970-----	1, 150, 000	1, 150, 000	-----
91-273	1969-----	300, 000	300, 000	-----
91-272	Fees of jurors and commissioners-----	800, 000	500, 000	- 300, 000
91-272	Travel and miscellaneous expenses-----	625, 000	500, 000	- 125, 000
91-272	Administrative Office of the United States Courts-----	50, 000	15, 000	- 35, 000
91-272	Expenses of referees-----	34, 000	-----	- 34, 000
	Total, courts of appeals, district courts, and other judicial services--	3, 664, 000	3, 015, 000	- 649, 000
	Total, the Judiciary:			
	1970-----	3, 424, 500	2, 733, 000	- 691, 500
	1969-----	300, 000	300, 000	-----
	Total-----	3, 724, 500	3, 033, 000	- 691, 500

**COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS
RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL—Continued**

TITLE I

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimates	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with estimates
	RELATED AGENCIES			
	OFFICE OF EDUCATION			
91-272	Civil rights education-----	\$10, 000, 000	\$5, 000, 000	-\$5, 000, 000
	SPECIAL REPRESENTATIVE FOR TRADE NEGOTIATIONS			
91-272	Salaries and expenses-----	60, 000	-----	-----60, 000
	Total, related agencies-----	10, 060, 000	5, 000, 000	-----5, 060, 000
	Total, chapter X:			
	New budget (obligational) authority:			
	1969-----	300, 000	300, 000	-----
	1970-----	27, 281, 500	21, 330, 000	-----5, 951, 500
	Total-----	27, 581, 500	21, 630, 000	-----5, 951, 500

CHAPTER XI

SUBCOMMITTEE ON DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AND RELATED AGENCIES

EDWARD P. BOLAND, Massachusetts, *Chairman*JOHN J. McFALL, CALIFORNIA
SIDNEY R. YATES, ILLINOIS
TOM STEED, OKLAHOMASILVIO O. CONTE, MASSACHUSETTS
WILLIAM E. MINSHALL, OHIO
JACK EDWARDS, ALABAMA

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

COAST GUARD

RETIRED PAY

The Committee recommends the budget estimate of \$1,250,000 for payments to retired Coast Guard personnel. The funds recommended will provide for increased military retired pay costs resulting from mandatory increases tied to rises in the Consumer Price Index.

RELATED AGENCY

WASHINGTON METROPOLITAN AREA TRANSIT AUTHORITY

FEDERAL CONTRIBUTION

The Committee has approved the full \$82,939,000 requested for the Federal share of the adopted regional rail rapid transit system, despite the fact that construction contracts have again been frozen by the Secretary of Transportation. It is distressing that the construction of this much needed system should encounter any additional delays. The Committee feels that the problems that occasioned the delays should have been addressed and resolved months ago before actual construction of the system was initiated.

**COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS
RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL**

TITLE I

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimates	Recommended in the bill	Bill compared with estimates
	CHAPTER XI			
	DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION			
	Coast Guard			
91-306	Retired pay-----	\$1, 250, 000	\$1, 250, 000	-----
	RELATED AGENCY			
	WASHINGTON METROPOLITAN AREA TRANSIT AUTHORITY			
	Federal Contribution-----	82, 939, 000	82, 939, 000	-----
91-272	Total, Chapter XI, new budget (obligational) authority-----	84, 189, 000	84, 189, 000	-----

CHAPTER XII

SUBCOMMITTEE ON DEPARTMENTS OF TREASURY AND POST OFFICE
AND EXECUTIVE OFFICE**TOM STEED, Oklahoma, *Chairman***

OTTO E. PASSMAN, LOUISIANA

HOWARD W. ROBISON, NEW YORK

JOSEPH P. ADDABBO, NEW YORK

SILVIO O. CONTE, MASSACHUSETTS

JEFFERY COHELAN, CALIFORNIA

JACK EDWARDS, ALABAMA

TREASURY DEPARTMENT

BUREAU OF THE PUBLIC DEBT

ADMINISTERING THE PUBLIC DEBT

The Committee recommends the full amount of the supplemental request of \$3,250,000 for fiscal year 1970. This recommendation would increase new budget (obligational) authority for this Bureau from \$60,370,000 to \$63,620,000 in fiscal year 1970, excluding the additional allowance to cover pay raise costs contained in Title II of the accompanying bill.

The appropriation recommended will provide funds to reimburse paying agents for redemptions of savings type securities, estimated at \$1,000,000; for reimbursing Federal Reserve Banks for operating expenses in connection with activities as fiscal agents of the Treasury, \$2,000,000; and \$250,000 for printing of marketable securities.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

(Out of Postal Fund)

TRANSPORTATION

The committee recommends the full amount of the supplemental request of \$10,700,000 for increased costs of transporting the mail during Fiscal Year 1970. Under the recommendation, the total new budget (obligational) authority for fiscal year 1970 for Transportation of mail would be \$640,700,000. No personnel are paid from this account.

The amount recommended would provide \$3,200,000 for highway-intercity transportation wage determinations by the Labor Department under the Service Contract Act of 1965; \$6,200,000 for terminal and piece handling increases negotiated with railroads; \$1,000,000 for air-taxi rate adjustments by the Civil Aeronautics Board; and \$300,000 for air carrier rate increases for transportation of mail to Guam.

RELATED AGENCY

TAX COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

The Committee recommends the full budget request of \$83,000, increasing total new budget (obligational) authority for the Tax Court to \$2,898,000 for the Fiscal year, excluding the allowance for pay raise costs included in Title II of the accompanying bill.

The amount recommended will provide funds for increased expenses resulting from changes brought about by the Tax Reform Act of 1969 (Public Law 91-172), approved December 30, 1969. These changes include the addition of two commissioners, with support staff and related costs, in connection with the Small Case Procedure established in the Court to hear and adjudicate tax disputes involving deficiencies of \$1,000 or less.

**COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS
RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL**

TITLE I

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimates	Recommended in the bill	Bill compared with estimates
	CHAPTER XII			
	TREASURY DEPARTMENT			
	BUREAU OF THE PUBLIC DEBT			
91-272	Administering the Public Debt-----	\$3, 250, 000	\$3, 250, 000	-----
	POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT			
	(Out of Postal Fund)			
91-272	Transportation-----	10, 700, 000	10, 700, 000	-----
	INDEPENDENT AGENCIES			
	TAX COURT OF THE UNITED STATES			
91-272	Salaries and expenses-----	83, 000	83, 000	-----
	Total, Chapter XII, new budget (obligational) authority-----	14, 033, 000	14, 033, 000	-----

CHAPTER XIII

CLAIMS AND JUDGMENTS

The Committee recommends the appropriation of \$6,591,406, the amount of the estimate, for claims and judgments rendered against the United States. Of this amount, \$4,302,059 represents damage and other type claims, the payments of which are due under various laws, and \$2,289,347 represents judgments rendered by the U.S. Court of Claims and U.S. District Courts. Details concerning these claims and judgments are contained in House Document No. 91-315.

TITLES II AND III

INCREASED PAY COSTS

Following is a summary of new budget (obligational) authority for pay cost increases in the bill:

	Budget authority estimates	Bill	Difference
Title I.....	\$96,781,000	\$96,781,000	
Title II.....	3,023,804,670	2,909,729,830	-114,074,840
Title III (indefinite).....	1,350,000,000	1,350,000,000	
Total.....	4,470,585,670	4,356,510,830	-114,074,840

TITLE II

Title II of the bill includes the bulk of supplemental funds required to meet the unabsorbed portion of increased pay and related costs for fiscal 1970. Title I of the bill includes the remainder of the funds for this purpose. The regular 1970 appropriations did not allow for these costs, and agencies have been spending on a deficiency basis as the law permits in such cases. (Section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665)).

The greatest share of increased pay costs in this title result from the Federal comparability pay raises made effective July 1, 1969. These increases result from Public laws 90-206 and 90-207, which cover postal and other civilian employees, military personnel, legislative, and judicial employees. Increases for employees of the District of Columbia as well as for wage-board employees in line with prevailing rates are also covered by this title.

The total cost of these pay increases was estimated in the February, 1970 budget to be \$3,737,613,212. To cover the cost the President requested \$3,125,051,786 in new budget (obligational) authority in House Document 91-272 and proposed to absorb the difference from previously appropriated funds. The absorption amounts to \$612,561,426 or about 16% of the total.

The Committee has examined the individual requests, making reductions wherever they seemed reasonably possible. The largest single reduction is \$102,271,000 in the Department of Defense. It should be said that the Executive has also combed these estimates, and that they are for mandatory costs in effect during the entire fiscal year.

The committee also considered under title II a separate pay item for \$250,000 included in H. Doc. 91-306, but as usual deferred action on Senate items amounting to \$4,716,116, making the effective request considered \$3,120,585,670. The comparable committee recommendation is \$3,006,510,830, a reduction of \$114,074,840, distributed in the bill as follows: \$96,781,000 recommended under title I, the amount of the request; \$2,909,729,830 recommended under title II, a reduction of \$114,074,840 from the \$3,023,804,670 requested. Transfers between appropriations throughout title II amounting to \$42,181,900 have been approved and also contribute to limiting the amount of new budget (obligational) authority that would otherwise be necessary.

TITLE III

(Federal Employees Salary Act of 1970)

This title of the bill relates to additional funds for increased pay costs arising during the current fiscal year 1970 from enactment of Public Law 91-231, approved April 15, 1970, the Federal Employees Salary Act of 1970—the so-called 6% retroactive pay bill, effective generally back to December 27, 1969. (Title II of the bill, explained

above, relates to additional funds for civilian and military personnel pay increases that were generally effective from the beginning of the fiscal year 1970 last July 1st.)

The Committee recommends a single, lump-sum, indefinite appropriation for the purposes of Public Law 91-231. The best estimate available to the Committee of additional cost during the 6 months the law will be in effect in fiscal 1970 is \$1,350,000,000. That may or may not be the final additional total of appropriations actually put on the books under the indefinite provision in the bill. Some portion—now indeterminable—of the costs may eventually be absorbed by transfers between existing appropriations, or otherwise.

Moreover, in terms of aggregate budgetary spending totals for fiscal 1970 reflected in the February budget, the net add-on effect would be about \$1,175,000,000. This net budgetary add-on results from the offset effect of a lump-sum allowance of \$175,000,000 in the 1970 totals related to a postal pay raise proposal which was superseded by the version enacted as Public Law 91-231.

The appropriation—as does the law itself—covers additional costs of the pay increase in fiscal 1970 for military personnel; for postal employees; and, generally, those other civilian employees except where rates of pay are fixed periodically on a prevailing wage basis (so-called wage-board employees).

It covers all three branches of the Government. It includes the District of Columbia Government.

Except for technical conforming changes, the lump-sum, indefinite appropriation approach corresponds exactly with that used in similar retroactive pay situations in 1958 and 1955. (The President, in H. Doc. 91-322, has also recommended this approach.)

As explained in connection with title II pay cost supplementals, the Executive Branch—operating, as it has been, under an overall expenditure ceiling in fiscal 1970—screened those pay supplemental requests, looking for opportunities to absorb portions of the added costs by way of transfers of funds or otherwise. The Committee has similarly examined the supplemental requests and made reductions wherever it reasonably could. Under the circumstances, it did not seem to offer any productive results to go through yet another detailed, item-by-item calculation, submission, review, and recommendation, covering essentially the same ground this late in the fiscal year.

Thus the recommendation for a single, indefinite appropriation, which procedurally would work this way:

1. *Section 301* makes the appropriation of “such amounts as may be necessary”, but carries the safeguard that no appropriation may be increased beyond the costs attributable to the basic law.

2. *Section 302* gives authority to transfer unobligated balances from funds otherwise expiring for obligation on June 30, 1970 (to assist in meeting the increased costs and thus diminishing the added appropriation otherwise required).

3. *Section 303* provides the procedure for certifying the amounts of added appropriations required, but as to both this and any transfers under section 302 relating to the Executive Branch, requires the approval of the Director of the Budget.

4. *Sections 304-306* are also facilitating, are self-explanatory, and, among other things, require the Budget Director to submit a complete report to Congress not later than October 15, 1970 on the actual transfers made and the actual appropriations put on the books under the provisions of this title.

**COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS
RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL
TITLES II AND III—INCREASED PAY COSTS**

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimates	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with estimates
	TITLE II			
	LEGISLATIVE BRANCH			
	HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES			
91-272	Office of the Speaker-----	\$11, 640	-----	—\$11, 640
91-272	Office of the Parliamentarian-----	10, 865	\$10, 865	-----
91-272	Compilation of precedents of House of Representatives-----	1, 330	1, 330	-----
91-272	Office of the Chaplain-----	1, 805	1, 805	-----
91-272	Office of the Clerk-----	221, 600	100, 000	—121, 600
91-272	Office of the Sergeant at Arms-----	296, 500	250, 000	—46, 500
91-272	Office of the Doorkeeper-----	228, 650	120, 000	—108, 650
91-272	Office of the Postmaster-----	62, 900	62, 900	-----
91-272	Committee employees-----	750, 000	700, 000	—50, 000

**COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS
RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL—Continued**

TITLES II AND III—INCREASED PAY COSTS

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimates	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with estimates
	TITLE II—Continued			
	LEGISLATIVE BRANCH—Continued			
	HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Continued			
91-272	Special and minority employees:			
	Minority employees-----	\$5, 845	-----	—\$5, 845
	House Democratic steering committee-----	1, 310	\$1, 310	-----
	House Republican conference-----	1, 310	1, 310	-----
	Majority leader-----	8, 135	8, 135	-----
	Minority leader-----	7, 265	7, 265	-----
	Majority whip-----	5, 525	5, 525	-----
	Minority whip-----	5, 525	5, 525	-----
	Printing clerks-----	1, 885	-----	-----
	Technical assistant in the office of the attending physician-----	1, 695	-----	-----
91-272	Official reporters of debates-----	32, 605	32, 605	-----
91-272	Official reporters to committees-----	32, 370	32, 370	-----

91-272	Committee on Appropriations (investigations)-----	89, 445	89, 445	-----
91-272	Office of the legislative counsel-----	46, 800	23, 400	- 23, 400
91-272	Members' clerk hire-----	1, 000, 000	850, 000	- 150, 000
91-272& 91-306	Contingent expenses of the House:			
	Government contributions-----	760, 000	760, 000	-----
	Speaker's automobile-----	1, 500	1, 500	-----
	Majority leader's automobile-----	1, 500	1, 500	-----
	Minority leader's automobile-----	1, 500	1, 500	-----
	Total, House of Representatives-----	3, 589, 505	3, 068, 290	- 521, 215

JOINT ITEMS

91-272	Joint Committee on Reduction of Federal Expenditures-----	5, 725	-----	- 5, 725
91-272	Contingent expenses of the Senate:			
	Joint Economic Committee-----	44, 490	44, 490	-----
	Joint Committee on Atomic Energy-----	32, 460	32, 460	-----
	Joint Committee on Printing-----	22, 175	15, 175	- 7, 000
91-272	Contingent expenses of the House:			
	Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation-----	60, 065	10, 065	- 50, 000
	Joint Committee on Defense Production-----	10, 850	10, 850	-----
	Total, joint items-----	175, 765	113, 040	- 62, 725

**COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS
RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL—Continued**

TITLES II AND III—INCREASED PAY COSTS

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimates	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with estimates
	TITLE II—Continued			
	LEGISLATIVE BRANCH—Continued			
	ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL			
91-272	Office of the Architect of the Capitol: Salaries.....	\$63, 000	\$56, 000	—\$7, 000
91-272	Capitol buildings and grounds:			
	Capitol buildings.....	70, 500	55, 500	—15, 000
	Capitol grounds.....	28, 200	28, 200	-----
	House office buildings.....	155, 500	120, 000	—35, 500
	Capitol power plant.....	20, 800	20, 800	-----
91-272	Library buildings and grounds: Structural and mechanical care.....	25, 600	10, 000	—15, 600
	Total, Architect of the Capitol.....	1 363, 600	290, 500	—73, 100
91-272	BOTANIC GARDEN			
	Salaries and expenses.....	24, 000	24, 000	-----
91-272	LIBRARY OF CONGRESS			
	Salaries and expenses.....	1, 321, 500	1, 313, 500	—8, 000
91-272	Copyright Office: Salaries and expenses.....	274, 000	274, 000	-----

91-272	Legislative Reference Service: Salaries and expenses-----	414, 000	414, 000	-----
91-272	Distribution of catalog cards: Salaries and expenses-----	359, 000	² 159, 000	- 200, 000
91-272	Books for the blind and physically handicapped: Salaries and expenses-----	56, 000	33, 000	- 23, 000
91-272	Organizing and microfilming the papers of the Presidents: Salaries and expenses-----	13, 200	13, 200	-----
91-272	Collection and distribution of library materials (special foreign currency program)-----	16, 000	14, 000	- 2, 000
	Total, Library of Congress-----	2, 453, 700	2, 220, 700	- 233, 000
	GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE			
91-272	Office of Superintendent of Documents: Salaries and expenses-----	495, 400	² 395, 400	- 100, 000
	GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE			
91-272	Salaries and expenses-----	5, 142, 000	5, 142, 000	-----
	Total, legislative branch: New budget (obligational) authority-----	³ 12, 243, 970	11, 253, 930	- 990, 040
	THE JUDICIARY			
	SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES			
91-272	Salaries-----	194, 000	194, 000	-----
91-272	Care of the buildings and grounds-----	21, 700	21, 700	-----
	Total, Supreme Court of the United States-----	215, 700	215, 700	-----
	COURT OF CUSTOMS AND PATENT APPEALS			
91-272	Salaries and expenses-----	32, 000	22, 000	- 10, 000

¹ Excludes items for the Senate.² And in addition the reserve fund of \$200,000 under this head, fiscal year 1970, may be used for increased pay costs.³ Excludes \$4,716,116 for 1970 relating to Senate items under that heading and under the Architect of the Capitol.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS
RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL—Continued
TITLES II AND III—INCREASED PAY COSTS

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimates	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with estimates
	TITLE II—Continued			
	THE JUDICIARY—Continued			
	CUSTOMS COURT			
91-272	Salaries and expenses-----	\$128, 500	\$128, 500	-----
	COURT OF CLAIMS			
91-272	Salaries and expenses-----	73, 000	-----	----- --\$73, 000
	COURTS OF APPEALS, DISTRICT COURTS, AND OTHER JUDICIAL SERVICES			
91-272	Salaries of supporting personnel-----	4, 670, 000	4, 370, 000	----- --300, 000
91-272	Administrative Office of the United States Courts-----	170, 000	170, 000	-----
	<i>By transfer</i> -----	(20, 000)	(20, 000)	-----
91-272	Salaries of referees-----	14, 500	-----	----- --14, 500
91-272	Expenses of referees-----	608, 000	608, 000	-----
	Total, Courts of appeals, district courts, and other judicial services-----	5, 462, 500	5, 148, 000	----- --314, 500
	Total, the Judiciary: New budget (obligational) authority-----	5, 911, 700	5, 514, 200	----- --397, 500

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

THE WHITE HOUSE OFFICE

91-272 Salaries and expenses-----

310, 000

310, 000

91-272 EXECUTIVE MANSION
Operating expenses-----

48, 000

48, 000

91-272 BUREAU OF THE BUDGET
Salaries and expenses-----

491, 000

491, 000

91-272 COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS
Salaries and expenses-----

50, 000

50, 000

91-272 NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE COUNCIL
Salaries and expenses-----

49, 000

49, 000

91-272 OFFICE OF EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS
Salaries and expenses-----

290, 000

290, 000

91-272 SPECIAL REPRESENTATIVE FOR TRADE NEGOTIATIONS
Salaries and expenses-----

51, 000

51, 000

Total, Executive Office of the President:
New budget (obligational) authority-----

1, 289, 000

1, 289, 000

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

PEACE CORPS

91-272 Salaries and expenses (*Increase in limitation on administrative expenses*)-----

(1, 651, 000)

(1, 651, 000)

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS
RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL—Continued
TITLES II AND III—INCREASED PAY COSTS

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimates	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with estimates
	TITLE II—Continued			
	FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT—Continued			
	FOREIGN ASSISTANCE			
	ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE			
91-272	Administrative expenses (<i>by transfer</i>)-----	(\$3, 200, 000)	(\$3, 200, 000)	-----
91-272	Administrative and other expenses (<i>by transfer</i>)-----	(214, 000)	(200, 000)	(-\$14, 000)
	Total, funds appropriated to the President:			
	<i>By transfer</i> -----	(3, 414, 000)	(3, 400, 000)	(-14, 000)
	<i>Increase in limitation on administrative expenses</i> -----	(1, 651, 000)	(1, 651, 000)	-----
	DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE			
	AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH SERVICE			
91-272	Salaries and expenses-----	13, 661, 000	13, 500, 000	-161, 000
	COOPERATIVE STATE RESEARCH SERVICE			
91-272	Payments and expenses-----	138, 000	130, 000	-8, 000
	FEDERAL EXTENSION SERVICE			
91-272	Cooperative extension work, payments and expenses-----	250, 000	250, 000	-----
	FARMER COOPERATIVE SERVICE			
91-272	Salaries and expenses-----	131, 000	131, 000	-----

SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE			
91-272	Conservation operations.....	9, 450, 000	9, 450, 000
91-272	River basin surveys and investigations.....	652, 000	652, 000
91-272	Watershed planning.....	491, 000	491, 000
91-272	Watershed works of improvement.....	2, 159, 000	2, 159, 000
91-272	Flood prevention.....	815, 000	815, 000
91-272	Great Plains conservation program.....	342, 000	342, 000
91-272	Resource conservation and development.....	573, 000	573, 000
	Total, Soil Conservation Service.....	14, 482, 000	14, 482, 000
ECONOMIC RESEARCH SERVICE			
91-272	Salaries and expenses.....	1, 142, 000	1, 142, 000
STATISTICAL REPORTING SERVICE			
91-272	Salaries and expenses.....	1, 116, 000	1, 116, 000
CONSUMER AND MARKETING SERVICE			
91-272	Consumer protective, marketing, and regulatory programs.....	6, 286, 000	5, 250, 000
FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL SERVICE			
91-272	Salaries and expenses.....	630, 000	600, 000
COMMODITY EXCHANGE AUTHORITY			
91-272	Salaries and expenses.....	170, 000	170, 000
			—1, 036, 000
			—30, 000

**COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS
RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL—Continued**

TITLES II AND III—INCREASED PAY COSTS

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimates	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with estimates
	TITLE II—Continued			
	DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE—Continued			
	AGRICULTURAL STABILIZATION AND CONSERVATION SERVICE			
91-272	Expenses, Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service-----	\$6, 090, 000	\$6, 000, 000	—\$90, 000
91-272	<i>By transfer</i> -----	(1, 899, 000)	(1, 899, 000)	-----
	OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL			
91-272	Salaries and expenses-----	1, 022, 000	1, 022, 000	-----
	PACKERS AND STOCKYARDS ADMINISTRATION			
91-272	Salaries and expenses-----	154, 000	154, 000	-----
	OFFICE OF THE GENERAL COUNSEL			
91-272	Salaries and expenses-----	427, 000	427, 000	-----
	OFFICE OF INFORMATION			
91-272	Salaries and expenses-----	150, 000	150, 000	-----
	NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL LIBRARY			
91-272	Salaries and expenses-----	175, 000	175, 000	-----

OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT SERVICES			
91-272	Salaries and expenses-----	237, 000	237, 000-----
GENERAL ADMINISTRATION			
91-272	Salaries and expenses-----	438, 000	425, 000----- - 13, 000
RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION			
91-272	Salaries and expenses-----	1, 075, 000	1, 075, 000-----
FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION			
91-272	Salaries and expenses-----	5, 365, 000	5, 200, 000----- - 165, 000
FOREST SERVICE			
91-272	Forest protection and utilization-----	10, 266, 000	10, 266, 000-----
FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE CORPORATION			
91-272	Administrative and operating expenses (<i>By transfer</i>)-----	(891, 000)	(891, 000)-----
Total, Department of Agriculture: New Budget (obligational) authority <i>By transfer</i> -----			
		63, 405, 000 (2, 590, 000)	61, 902, 000 (2, 590, 000)----- - 1, 503, 000
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE			
GENERAL ADMINISTRATION			
91-272	Salaries and expenses-----	604, 000	604, 000-----
OFFICE OF BUSINESS ECONOMICS			
91-272	Salaries and expenses-----	238, 000	238, 000-----

**COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS
RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL—Continued**

TITLES II AND III—INCREASED PAY COSTS

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimates	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with estimates
	TITLE II—Continued			
	DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE—Continued			
	BUREAU OF THE CENSUS			
91-272	Salaries and expenses	\$1, 141, 000	\$1, 141, 000	-----
91-272	Nineteenth Decennial Census	6, 722, 000	6, 722, 000	-----
91-272	1967 economic censuses	282, 000	282, 000	-----
	Total, Bureau of the Census	8, 145, 000	8, 145, 000	-----
	ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION			
91-272	Planning, technical assistance and research	79, 000	-----	—\$79, 000
91-272	Operations and administration	1, 121, 000	1, 121, 000	-----
	Total, Economic Development Administration	1, 200, 000	1, 121, 000	—79, 000
	BUSINESS AND DEFENSE SERVICES ADMINISTRATION			
91-272	Salaries and expenses	505, 000	505, 000	-----
	INTERNATIONAL ACTIVITIES			
91-272	Salaries and expenses	835, 000	835, 000	-----

91-272	Export control-----	446, 000	446, 000	-----
	Total, International activities-----	1, 281, 000	1, 281, 000	-----
	OFFICE OF FIELD SERVICES			
91-272	Salaries and expenses-----	389, 000	389, 000	-----
	MINORITY BUSINESS ENTERPRISE			
91-272	Salaries and expenses-----	94, 000	94, 000	-----
	FOREIGN DIRECT INVESTMENT CONTROL			
91-272	Salaries and expenses-----	100, 000	100, 000	-----
	ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCE SERVICES ADMINISTRATION			
91-272	Salaries and expenses-----	8, 040, 000	8, 040, 000	-----
91-272	Research and development-----	1, 239, 000	1, 239, 000	-----
91-272	Satellite operations-----	421, 000	421, 000	-----
	Total, Environmental Science Services Administration-----	9, 700, 000	9, 700, 000	-----
	PATENT OFFICE			
91-272	Salaries and expenses-----	3, 135, 000	3, 135, 000	-----
	NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS			
91-272	Research and technical services-----	2, 187, 000	2, 187, 000	-----
	MARITIME ADMINISTRATION			
91-272	Salaries and expenses, for administrative expenses-----	746, 000	746, 000	-----

91-272	Reserve personnel, Marine Corps-----	4, 000, 000	4, 000, 000	-----
91-272	Reserve personnel, Air Force-----	7, 100, 000	-----	-7, 100, 000
91-272	National Guard personnel, Army-----	33, 900, 000	33, 500, 000	-400, 000
91-272	National Guard personnel, Air Force-----	10, 300, 000	10, 000, 000	-300, 000
	Total, military personnel-----	1, 655, 900, 000	1, 582, 700, 000	-73, 200, 000
	RETIRED MILITARY PERSONNEL			
91-272	Retired pay, Defense-----	25, 000, 000	25, 000, 000	-----
	OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE			
91-272	Operation and maintenance, Army-----	206, 900, 000	196, 480, 000	-10, 420, 000
91-272	Operation and maintenance, Navy-----	166, 100, 000	157, 800, 000	-8, 300, 000
91-272	Operation and maintenance, Marine Corps-----	7, 400, 000	7, 000, 000	-400, 000
91-272	Operation and maintenance, Air Force-----	88, 600, 000	84, 200, 000	-4, 400, 000
91-272	Operation and maintenance, Defense agencies-----	74, 200, 000	70, 400, 000	-3, 800, 000
91-272	Operation and maintenance, Army National Guard-----	14, 800, 000	13, 800, 000	-1, 000, 000
91-272	Operation and maintenance, Air National Guard-----	13, 000, 000	12, 250, 000	-750, 000
91-272	Court of Military Appeals-----	71, 000	70, 000	-1, 000
	Total, operation and maintenance-----	571, 071, 000	542, 000, 000	-29, 071, 000

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS
RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL—Continued
TITLES II AND III—INCREASED PAY COSTS

II. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimates	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with estimates
	TITLE II—Continued			
	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—MILITARY—Continued			
	CIVIL DEFENSE			
91-272	Operation and maintenance-----	\$850, 000	\$850, 000	-----
	Total, Department of Defense—Military:			
	New budget (obligational) authority-----	2, 252, 821, 000	2, 150, 550, 000	—\$102, 271, 000
	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL			
	DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY			
	CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL			
91-272	Operation and maintenance, general-----	6, 905, 000	6, 905, 000	-----
91-272	General expenses-----	2, 000, 000	2, 000, 000	-----
	Total, Corps of Engineers—Civil-----	8, 905, 000	8, 905, 000	-----
91-272	Administration-----	209, 000	200, 000	—9, 000
	RYUKYU ISLANDS, ARMY			

91-272	UNITED STATES SOLDIERS' HOME Operation and maintenance-----	296, 000	296, 000	-----
		9, 410, 000	9, 401, 000	-9, 000
91-272	THE PANAMA CANAL CANAL ZONE GOVERNMENT Operating expenses-----	963, 000	963, 000	-----
		(605, 000)	(605, 000)	-----
91-272	PANAMA CANAL COMPANY FUND <i>Limitation on general and administrative expenses</i> -----			
		10, 373, 000	10, 364, 000	-9, 000
	Total, Department of Defense—Civil: New budget (obligational) authority----- <i>Limitation on general and administrative expenses</i> -----	(605, 000)	(605, 000)	-----
91-272	DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE CONSUMER PROTECTION AND ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH SERVICE Food and drug control (<i>by transfer</i>)-----	(2, 294, 000)	(2, 294, 000)	-----
		(1, 062, 000)	(1, 062, 000)	-----
91-272	Environmental control (<i>by transfer</i>)----- Office of the Administrator Salaries and expenses (<i>by transfer</i>)-----	(757, 000)	(757, 000)	-----
		(354, 000)	(354, 000)	-----
91-272	Total, Consumer Protection and Environmental Health Service (<i>by transfer</i>)-----	(4, 467, 000)	(4, 467, 000)	-----

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS
RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL—Continued

TITLES II AND III—INCREASED PAY COSTS

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimates	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with estimates
	TITLE II—Continued			
	DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE —Continued			
	HEALTH SERVICES AND MENTAL HEALTH ADMINISTRATION			
91-272	Mental health (<i>by transfer</i>) -----	(\$358, 000)	(\$358, 000)	-----
91-272	Saint Elizabeths Hospital (<i>by transfer</i>) -----	(2, 519, 000)	(2, 519, 000)	-----
91-272	Communicable diseases (<i>by transfer</i>) -----	(2, 446, 000)	(2, 446, 000)	-----
91-272	Hospital construction (<i>by transfer</i>) -----	(208, 000)	(208, 000)	-----
91-272	Patient care and special health services (<i>by transfer</i>) -----	(5, 241, 000)	(5, 241, 000)	-----
91-272	National health statistics (<i>by transfer</i>) -----	(329, 000)	(329, 000)	-----
91-272	Indian health services (<i>by transfer</i>) -----	(4, 464, 000)	(4, 464, 000)	-----
91-272	Office of the Administrator, salaries and expenses (<i>by transfer</i>) -----	(691, 000)	(691, 000)	-----
	Total, Health Services and Mental Health Administration (<i>by transfer</i>) -----	(16, 256, 000)	(16, 256, 000)	-----
	NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH			
91-272	Office of the Director, salaries and expenses (<i>by transfer</i>) -----	(218, 000)	(218, 000)	-----

OFFICE OF EDUCATION

91-272	School assistance in federally affected areas (<i>by transfer</i>)	(14, 000)	(14, 000)	-----
91-272	Libraries and community services (<i>by transfer</i>)	(300, 000)	(300, 000)	-----
91-272	Salaries and expenses (<i>by transfer</i>)	(2, 528, 000)	(2, 528, 000)	-----
	Total, Office of Education (<i>by transfer</i>)	(2, 842, 000)	(2, 842, 000)	=====
	SOCIAL AND REHABILITATION SERVICE			=====
91-272	Salaries and expenses (<i>by transfer</i>)	(2, 496, 000)	(2, 496, 000)	-----
91-272	Assistance to refugees in the United States (<i>by transfer</i>)	(94, 000)	(90, 000)	(- \$4, 000)
	Total, Social and Rehabilitation Service (<i>by transfer</i>)	(2, 590, 000)	(2, 586, 000)	(- 4, 000)
	SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION			=====
91-272	<i>Limitation on salaries and expenses (trust fund)</i>	(21, 276, 000)	(21, 276, 000)	-----
	SPECIAL INSTITUTIONS			=====
91-272	Model Secondary School for the Deaf, salaries and expenses (<i>by transfer</i>)	(12, 000)	(12, 000)	-----
91-272	Gallaudet College, salaries and expenses (<i>by transfer</i>)	(162, 000)	(162, 000)	-----
91-272	Howard University, salaries and expenses (<i>by transfer</i>)	(664, 000)	(664, 000)	-----
91-272	Freedmen's Hospital (<i>by transfer</i>)	(766, 000)	(766, 000)	-----
	Total, special institutions (<i>b. transfer</i>)	(1, 604, 000)	(1, 604, 000)	=====
	DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT			=====
91-272	Office of the Secretary, salaries and expenses (<i>by transfer</i>)	(451, 000)	(451, 000)	-----

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS
RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL—Continued
TITLES II AND III—INCREASED PAY COSTS

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimates	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with estimates
	TITLE II—Continued			
	DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE —Continued			
	DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT—Continued			
91-272	Office for Civil Rights, salaries and expenses (<i>by transfer</i>) -----	(\$496, 000)	(\$496, 000)	-----
91-272	Office of Community and Field Services, salaries and expenses (<i>by transfer</i>) -----	(607, 000)	(607, 000)	-----
91-272	Office of the Comptroller, salaries and expenses (<i>by transfer</i>) -----	(1, 018, 000)	(1, 018, 000)	-----
91-272	Office of the Administrator, salaries and expenses (<i>by transfer</i>) -----	(476, 000)	(476, 000)	-----
91-272	Surplus property utilization (<i>by transfer</i>) -----	(107, 000)	(107, 000)	-----
91-272	Office of the General Counsel, salaries and expenses (<i>by transfer</i>) -----	(337, 000)	(337, 000)	-----
	Total, Departmental Management (<i>by transfer</i>) -----	(3, 492, 000)	(3, 492, 000)	-----
	Total, Department of Health, Education and Welfare:			
	<i>By transfer</i> -----	(31, 469, 000)	(31, 465, 000)	(-- \$4, 000)
	<i>Limitation on salaries and expenses (trust fund)</i> -----	(21, 276, 000)	(21, 276, 000)	-----

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT			
	RENEWAL AND HOUSING ASSISTANCE		
91-272	Salaries and expenses-----	2, 640, 000	2, 508, 000 -132, 000
	METROPOLITAN DEVELOPMENT		
91-272	Salaries and expenses-----	506, 000	480, 700 -25, 300
	MODEL CITIES AND GOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS		
91-272	Salaries and expenses-----	29, 000	27, 600 -1, 400
	(By transfer)-----	(422, 000)	(400, 900) (-21, 100)
	FEDERAL INSURANCE ADMINISTRATION		
91-272	Flood insurance-----	30, 000	28, 500 -1, 500
	FAIR HOUSING AND EQUAL OPPORTUNITY		
91-272	Fair housing and equal opportunity-----	412, 000	391, 400 -20, 600
	DEPARTMENT MANAGEMENT		
91-272	General Administration-----	589, 000	559, 500 -29, 500
91-272	Regional management and services-----	690, 000	655, 000 -35, 000
	Total, Department Management-----	1, 279, 000	1, 214, 500 -64, 500
	COLLEGE HOUSING LOANS		
91-272	Limitation on administrative expenses-----	(79, 000)	(75, 000) (-4, 000)

**COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS
RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL—Continued**

TITLES II AND III—INCREASED PAY COSTS

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimates	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with estimates
	Title II			
	DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT —Continued			
	DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT—Continued			
	PUBLIC FACILITY LOANS			
91-272	<i>Limitation on administrative expenses</i> -----	(\$58, 000)	(\$55, 000)	(-\$3, 000)
	REVOLVING FUND (LIQUIDATING PROGRAMS)			
91-272	<i>Limitation on administrative expenses</i> -----	(7, 000)	(6, 700)	(-300)
	FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION			
91-272	<i>Limitation on administrative expenses</i> -----	(450, 000)	(450, 000)	-----
91-272	<i>Limitation on nonadministrative expenses</i> -----	(6, 175, 000)	(5, 175, 000)	(-1, 000, 000)
	Total, Department of Housing and Urban Development:			
	New budget (obligational) authority-----	4, 896, 000	4, 650, 700	-245, 300
	<i>By transfer</i> -----	(422, 000)	(400, 900)	(-21, 100)
	<i>Limitations on administrative expenses</i> -----	(6, 769, 000)	(5, 761, 700)	(-1, 007, 300)
	DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR			
	BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT			
91-272	Management of lands and resources-----	3, 498, 000	3, 498, 000	-----

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

91-272	Education and welfare services-----	9,799,000	9,799,000	-----
91-272	Resources management-----	4,378,000	4,378,000	-----
91-272	General administrative expenses-----	513,000	500,000	-13,000
	Total, Bureau of Indian Affairs-----	14,690,000	14,677,000	-13,000

BUREAU OF OUTDOOR RECREATION

91-272	Salaries and expenses-----	275,000	200,000	-75,000
--------	----------------------------	---------	---------	---------

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

91-272	Surveys, investigations, and research-----	3,310,000	3,310,000	-----
--------	--	-----------	-----------	-------

BUREAU OF MINES

91-272	Conservation and development of mineral resources-----	3,164,000	3,164,000	-----
91-272	Health and safety-----	1,120,000	1,120,000	-----
91-272	General administrative expenses-----	152,000	152,000	-----
	Total, Bureau of Mines-----	4,436,000	4,436,000	-----

OFFICE OF OIL AND GAS

91-272	Salaries and expenses-----	91,000	91,000	-----
--------	----------------------------	--------	--------	-------

BUREAU OF COMMERCIAL FISHERIES

91-272	Management and investigations of resources-----	936,000	936,000	-----
91-272	Federal aid for commercial fisheries research and development-----	13,000	13,000	-----
91-272	Anadromous and Great Lakes fisheries conservation-----	11,000	11,000	-----

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS
RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL—Continued

TITLES II AND III--INCREASED PAY COSTS

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimates	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with estimates
	TITLE II—Continued			
	DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR—Continued			
91-272	General administrative expenses.....	\$131,000	\$131,000	-----
91-272	Administration of Pribilof Islands.....	120,000	120,000	-----
91-272	Limitation on administrative expenses, fisheries loan fund (<i>increase in limitation on administrative expenses</i>)	(25,000)	(25,000)	-----
	Total, Bureau of Commercial Fisheries:			
	New budget (obligational) authority	1,211,000	1,211,000	-----
	<i>Limitation on administrative expenses</i>	(25,000)	(25,000)	-----
	BUREAU OF SPORT FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE			
	Management and investigations of resources.....	3,363,000	3,363,000	-----
91-272	General administrative expenses.....	176,000	176,000	-----
91-272	Anadromous and Great Lakes fisheries conservation.....	17,000	17,000	-----
	Total, Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife.....	3,556,000	3,556,000	-----
	NATIONAL PARK SERVICE			
91-272	Management and protection.....	3,384,000	3,359,000	-\$25,000

91-272	Maintenance and rehabilitation of physical facilities-----	1, 346, 000	1, 346, 000	-----
91-272	General administrative expenses-----	288, 000	263, 000	- 25, 000
91-272	Preservation of historic properties-----	50, 000	40, 000	- 10, 000
	Total, National Park Service-----	5, 068, 000	5, 008, 000	- 60, 000
	BUREAU OF RECLAMATION			
91-272	General investigations-----	900, 000	900, 000	-----
91-272	Operation and maintenance-----	1, 870, 000	1, 870, 000	-----
91-272	General administrative expenses-----	970, 000	970, 000	-----
	Total, Bureau of Reclamation-----	3, 740, 000	3, 740, 000	-----
	BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION			
91-272	Operation and maintenance-----	800, 000	800, 000	-----
	SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION			
91-272	Operation and maintenance-----	24, 000	-----	- 24, 000
	SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION			
91-272	Operation and maintenance-----	155, 000	155, 000	-----
	OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR			
91-272	Salaries and expenses-----	474, 000	374, 000	- 100, 000
	OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY			
91-272	Salaries and expenses-----	802, 000	702, 000	- 100, 000

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS
RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL—Continued
TITLES II AND III—INCREASED PAY COSTS

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimates	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with estimates
	TITLE II—Continued			
	DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR—Continued			
	OFFICE OF WATER RESOURCES RESEARCH			
91-272	Salaries and expenses-----	\$52, 000	\$52, 000	-----
	Total, Department of the Interior:			
	New budget (obligational) authority-----	42, 182, 000	41, 810, 000	—\$372, 000
	<i>Limitation on administrative expenses</i> -----	(25, 000)	(25, 000)	-----
	DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE			
	LEGAL ACTIVITIES AND GENERAL ADMINISTRATION			
91-272	Salaries and expenses, general administration-----	634, 000	634, 000	-----
91-272	Salaries and expenses, general legal activities-----	2, 264, 000	2, 264, 000	-----
91-272	Salaries and expenses, Antitrust Division-----	769, 000	769, 000	-----
91-272	Salaries and expenses, United States attorneys and marshals-----	3, 824, 000	3, 824, 000	-----
91-272	Salaries and expenses, Community Relations Service-----	230, 000	230, 000	-----
	Total, Legal Activities and General Administration-----	7, 721, 000	7, 721, 000	-----

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

91-272

Salaries and expenses-----

17, 455, 000

17, 455, 000

IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE

91-272

Salaries and expenses-----

7, 452, 000

7, 452, 000

FEDERAL PRISON SYSTEM

91-272

Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Prisons-----

5, 109, 000

5, 109, 000

BUREAU OF NARCOTICS AND DANGEROUS DRUGS

91-272

Salaries and expenses-----

1, 530, 000

1, 530, 000

Total, Department of Justice:

New budget (obligational) authority-----

39, 267, 000

39, 267, 000

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

MANPOWER ADMINISTRATION

91-272

Manpower development and training activities-----

\$45, 000

\$45, 000

91-272

By transfer-----

(100, 000)

(100, 000)

91-272

Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training, salaries and expenses-----

343, 000

343, 000

91-272

Bureau of Employment Security, salaries and expenses (*limitation on administrative expenses*)-----

(1, 408, 000)

(1, 408, 000)

Total, Manpower Administration-----

388, 000

388, 000

By transfer-----

(100, 000)

(100, 000)

Limitation on administrative expenses-----

(1, 408, 000)

(1, 408, 000)

**COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS
RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL—Continued**

TITLES II AND III—INCREASED PAY COSTS

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimates	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with estimates
	TITLE II—Continued			
	DEPARTMENT OF LABOR—Continued			
	LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS			
91-272	Labor-Management Services Administration, salaries and expenses--	\$805, 000	\$805, 000	-----
	WAGE AND LABOR STANDARDS			
91-272	Wage and Labor Standards Administration, salaries and expenses--	713, 000	713, 000	-----
91-272	Wage and Hour Division, salaries and expenses--	1, 440, 000	1, 440, 000	-----
	Total, Wage and Labor Standards--	2, 153, 000	2, 153, 000	-----
	BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS			
91-272	Salaries and expenses--	1, 693, 000	1, 693, 000	-----
	BUREAU OF INTERNATIONAL LABOR AFFAIRS			
91-272	Salaries and expenses--	130, 000	130, 000	-----
	OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR			
91-272	Salaries and expenses--	438, 000	438, 000	-----
91-272	<i>By transfer--</i>	(13, 000)	(13, 000)	-----

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

91-272	Salaries and expenses-----	515, 000	515, 000	-----
91-272	<i>By transfer</i> -----	(36, 000)	(36, 000)	-----
91-272	Federal contract compliance and civil rights program, salaries and expenses-----	56, 000	56, 000	-----
91-272	<i>By transfer</i> -----	(53, 000)	(53, 000)	-----
	Total, Office of the Secretary: New budget (obligational) authority-----	571, 000	571, 000	-----
	<i>By transfer</i> -----	(89, 000)	(89, 000)	-----
	Total, Department of Labor: New budget (obligational) authority-----	6, 178, 000	6, 178, 000	-----
	<i>By transfer</i> -----	(202, 000)	(202, 000)	-----
	<i>Limitation on administrative expense</i> -----	(1, 408, 000)	(1, 408, 000)	-----
	POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT (OUT OF POSTAL FUND)			
91-272	Administration and regional operation-----	10, 715, 000	10, 715, 000	-----
91-272	Research, development, and engineering-----	898, 000	898, 000	-----
91-272	Operations-----	261, 956, 000	261, 956, 000	-----
91-272	Supplies and services-----	215, 000	215, 000	-----
	Total, Post Office Department: New budget (obligational) authority-----	273, 784, 000	273, 784, 000	-----

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS
RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL—Continued
TITLES II AND III—INCREASED PAY COSTS

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimates	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with estimates
	TITLE II—Continued			
	DEPARTMENT OF STATE			
	ADMINISTRATION OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS			
91-272	Salaries and expenses-----	\$13, 400, 000	\$13, 400, 000	-----
91-272	Acquisition, operation and maintenance of buildings abroad-----	177, 000	177, 000	-----
	INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND CONFERENCES			
91-272	Missions to international organizations-----	340, 000	340, 000	-----
	INTERNATIONAL COMMISSIONS			
91-272	International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico:			
	Salaries and expenses-----	81, 000	81, 000	-----
	Operation and maintenance-----	175, 000	175, 000	-----
91-272	American sections, international commissions-----	42, 000	42, 000	-----
91-272	International fisheries commissions-----	56, 000	56, 000	-----
	Total, international commissions-----	354, 000	354, 000	-----

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS
RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL—Continued
TITLES II AND III—INCREASED PAY COSTS

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimates	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with estimates
	TITLE II—Continued			
	DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION—Continued			
	FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION			
91-272	Office of the administrator, salaries and expenses-----	\$132, 000	\$132, 000	-----
91-272	(<i>By transfer</i>)-----	(941, 000)	(941, 000)	-----
91-272	Highway beautification-----	92, 000	-----	—\$92, 000
91-272	Traffic and highway safety-----	678, 000	600, 000	—78, 000
91-272	Motor carrier safety-----	173, 000	173, 000	-----
91-272	Bureau of Public Roads, limitation on general expenses: <i>Increase in limitation on administrative expenses</i> -----	(3, 681, 000)	(3, 081, 000)	(—600, 000)
	Total, Federal Highway Administration-----	1, 075, 000	905, 000	—170, 000
	<i>By transfer</i> -----	(941, 000)	(941, 000)	-----
	<i>Limitation on administrative expenses</i> -----	(3, 681, 000)	(3, 081, 000)	(—600, 000)
	FEDERAL RAILROAD ADMINISTRATION			
91-272	Office of the Administrator, salaries and expenses-----	85, 000	85, 000	-----

91-272	Bureau of railroad safety-----	304, 000	270, 000	-34, 000
	Total, Federal Railroad Administration-----	389, 000	355, 000	-34, 000
	URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ADMINISTRATION			
91-272	Salaries and expenses-----	130, 000	100, 000	-30, 000
	ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION			
91-272	<i>Limitation on administrative expenses</i> -----	(52, 000)	(52, 000)	-----
	NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD			
91-272	Salaries and expenses-----	365, 000	350, 000	-15, 000
	Total, Department of Transportation:			
	New budget (obligational) authority-----	86, 051, 000	84, 102, 000	-1, 949, 000
	<i>By transfer</i> -----	(941, 000)	(941, 000)	-----
	<i>Limitation on administrative expenses</i> -----	(3, 733, 000)	(3, 133, 000)	(-600, 000)
	TREASURY DEPARTMENT			
	OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY			
91-272	Salaries and expenses-----	628, 000	628, 000	-----
	BUREAU OF ACCOUNTS			
91-272	Salaries and expenses-----	400, 000	400, 000	-----
	BUREAU OF CUSTOMS			
91-282	Salaries and expenses-----	8, 830, 000	8, 830, 000	-----

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS
RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL—Continued

TITLES II AND III—INCREASED PAY COSTS

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimates	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with estimates
	TITLE II—Continued			
	TREASURY DEPARTMENT—Continued			
	BUREAU OF THE MINT			
91-272	Salaries and expenses.....	\$500, 000	\$500, 000	-----
	BUREAU OF THE PUBLIC DEBT			
91-272	Administering the public debt.....	1, 444, 000	1, 444, 000	-----
	INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE			
91-272	Salaries and expenses.....	1, 846, 000	1, 846, 000	-----
91-272	Revenue accounting and processing.....	11, 920, 000	11, 920, 000	-----
91-272	Compliance.....	46, 291, 000	46, 291, 000	-----
	Total, Internal Revenue Service.....	60, 057, 000	60, 057, 000	-----
	OFFICE OF THE TREASURER			
91-272	Salaries and expenses.....	523, 000	523, 000	-----
	UNITED STATES SECRET SERVICE			
91-272	Salaries and expenses.....	1, 740, 000	1, 740, 000	-----
	Total, Treasury Department:			-----
	New Budget (obligational) authority.....	74, 122, 000	74, 122, 000	-----

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

91-272	Operating expenses-----	6, 368, 000	5, 000, 000	—\$1, 368, 000
	GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION			
91-272	Operating expenses, Public Buildings Service-----	7, 222, 000	7, 222, 000	-----
91-272	Operating expenses, Federal Supply Service-----	4, 431, 000	4, 431, 000	-----
91-272	Operating expenses, National Archives and Records Service-----	1, 635, 000	1, 635, 000	-----
91-272	Operating expenses Transportation and Communications Service-----	528, 000	528, 000	-----
91-272	Operating expenses, Property Management and Disposal Service-----	796, 000	796, 000	-----
91-272	Salaries and expenses, Office of Administrator-----	71, 000	71, 000	-----
	Total, General Services Administration:			
	New budget (obligational) authority-----	14, 683, 000	14, 683, 000	-----
	NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION			
91-272	Research and program management-----	41, 767, 000	38, 000, 000	—3, 767, 000
	VETERANS ADMINISTRATION			
91-272	Medical and prosthetic research-----	2, 983, 000	2, 983, 000	-----
91-272	Medical administration and miscellaneous operating expenses-----	955, 000	955, 000	-----
91-272	General operating expenses-----	15, 835, 000	15, 835, 000	-----
	Total, Veterans Administration: New budget (obligational) authority-----	19, 773, 000	19, 773, 000	-----

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS
RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL—Continued
TITLES II AND III—INCREASED PAY COSTS

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimates	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with estimates
TITLE II—Continued				
OTHER INDEPENDENT AGENCIES				
91-272	American Battle Monuments Commission: Salaries and expenses.....	\$77, 000	\$77, 000	-----
91-272	Civil Aeronautics Board: Salaries and expenses.....	910, 000	900, 000	—\$10, 000
91-272	Civil Service Commission: Salaries and expenses.....	2, 354, 000	2, 354, 000	-----
91-272	Equal Employment Opportunity Commission: Salaries and expenses..	900, 000	900, 000	-----
91-272	Export-Import Bank of the United States: <i>Increase in limitation on administrative expenses</i>	(439, 000)	(400, 000)	(—39, 000)
91-272	Farm Credit Administration: Limitation on administrative expenses: <i>Increase in limitation on administrative expenses</i>	(215, 000)	(215, 000)	-----
91-272	Federal Communications Commission: Salaries and expenses.....	1, 750, 000	1, 700, 000	—50, 000
91-272	Federal Field Committee for Development Planning in Alaska: Salaries and expenses.....	21, 000	21, 000	-----
FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD				
	Federal Home Loan Bank Board: Limitation on administrative and nonadministrative expenses:			
91-272	<i>Increase in limitation on administrative expenses</i>	(412, 000)	(412, 000)	-----

	<i>Increase in limitation on nonadministrative expenses</i>	(325, 000)	(325, 000)	
91-272	Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation: <i>Limitation on administrative expenses</i>	(24, 000)	(24, 000)	
91-272	Federal Maritime Commission: Salaries and expenses	328, 000	228, 000	- 100, 000
91-272	Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service: Salaries and expenses	615, 000	615, 000	
91-272	Federal Power Commission: Salaries and expenses	1, 336, 000	1, 300, 000	- 36, 000
91-272	Federal Radiation Council	8, 000	8, 000	
91-272	Federal Trade Commission	1, 500, 000	1, 000, 000	- 500, 000
91-272	Foreign Claims Settlement Commission: Salaries and expenses	56, 000	56, 000	
91-272	Historical and Memorial Commissions: American Revolution Bicentennial Commission: Salaries and expenses	12, 000	10, 000	- 2, 000
91-272	Inter-Agency Committee on Mexican-American Affairs: Salaries and expenses	27, 000	27, 000	
	Intergovernmental Agencies:			
91-272	Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental relations: Salaries and expenses	45, 000	45, 000	
91-272	Appalachian Regional Commission: Salaries and expenses (transfer)	(42, 000)		(- 42, 000)
91-272	Interstate Commerce Commission: Salaries and expenses	1, 975, 000	1, 900, 000	- 75, 000
91-272	National Capital Planning Commission: Salaries and expenses	75, 000	25, 000	- 50, 000
91-272	National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities: Salaries and expenses	120, 000	120, 000	

**COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS
RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL—Continued
TITLES II AND III—INCREASED PAY COSTS**

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimates	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with estimates
	TITLE II—Continued			
	OTHER INDEPENDENT AGENCIES—Continued			
	FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD—Continued			
91-272	National Labor Relations Board: Salaries and expenses-----	\$1, 642, 000	\$1, 642, 000	-----
91-272	National Mediation Board: Salaries and expenses-----	127, 000	127, 000	-----
91-272	President's Committee on Consumer Interests: Salaries and expenses--	10, 000	10, 000	-----
91-272	Railroad Retirement Board: Limitation on salaries and expenses (<i>increase in limitation on administrative expenses</i>)-----	(990, 000)	(990, 000)	-----
91-272	Renegotiation Board: Salaries and expenses-----	110, 000	110, 000	-----
91-272	Securities and Exchange Commission: Salaries and expenses-----	1, 200, 000	1, 000, 000	----- —\$200, 000
91-272	Small Business Administration: Salaries and expenses-----	808, 000	808, 000	-----
	(<i>By transfer</i>)-----	(3, 163, 000)	(3, 163, 000)	-----
91-272	Smithsonian Institution: Salaries and expenses-----	1, 431, 000	1, 331, 000	----- —100, 000

91-272	National Gallery of Art: Salaries and expenses-----	191, 000	191, 000	-----
91-272	Subversive Activities Control Board: Salaries and expenses-----	57, 000	57, 000	-----
91-272	Tariff Commission: Salaries and expenses-----	239, 000	239, 000	-----
91-272	Tax Court of the United States: Salaries and expenses-----	140, 000	140, 000	-----
91-272	United States Information Agency:			
	Salaries and expenses-----	6, 883, 000	6, 883, 000	-----
	Special international exhibitions-----	183, 000	183, 000	-----
	Total, other independent agencies: New budget (obligational) authority-----	25, 130, 000	24, 007, 000	1, 123, 000
	<i>By transfer</i> -----	(3, 205, 000)	(3, 163, 000)	(--42, 000)
	<i>Limitation on administrative expenses</i> -----	(1, 514, 000)	(1, 475, 000)	(--39, 000)

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FUNDS

91-272	<i>General operating expenses</i> -----	(1, 932, 000)	(1, 932, 000)	-----
91-272	<i>Public safety</i> -----	(1, 780, 000)	(1, 780, 000)	-----
91-272	<i>Education</i> -----	(966, 000)	(966, 000)	-----
91-272	<i>Parks and recreation</i> -----	(652, 000)	(652, 000)	-----
91-272	<i>Health and welfare</i> -----	(4, 478, 000)	(4, 478, 000)	-----

**COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS
RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL—Continued**

TITLES II AND III—INCREASED PAY COSTS

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimates	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with estimates
	TITLE II—Continued			
	DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—Continued			
91-272	<i>Highways and traffic</i> -----	(\$600, 000)	(\$600, 000)	-----
91-272	<i>Sanitary engineering</i> -----	(1, 096, 000)	(1, 096, 000)	-----
	Total, District of Columbia funds-----	(11, 504, 000)	(11, 504, 000)	-----
	Total, title II:			
	New budget (obligational) authority-----	3, 023, 804, 670	2, 909, 729, 830	—\$114, 074, 840
	<i>By transfer</i> -----	(42, 263, 000)	(42, 181, 900)	(—81, 100)
	<i>Limitation on administrative and nonadministrative expenses</i> -----	(36, 981, 000)	(35, 334, 700)	(1, 646, 300)
	TITLE III			
	Increased Pay Costs—Federal Employees Salary Act of 1970 (in- definite)-----	4 1, 350, 000, 000	4 1, 350, 000, 000	-----
	Grand total, title II and III—Increased pay costs:			
	New budget (obligational) authority:			
	Definite-----	3, 023, 804, 670	2, 909, 729, 830	—114, 074, 840
	Indefinite-----	4 1, 350, 000, 000	4 1, 350, 000, 000	-----

Total	4, 373, 804, 670	4, 259, 729, 830	-114, 074, 840
By transfer	(42, 263, 000)	(42, 181, 900)	(-81, 100)
Limitations on administrative and nonadministrative expenses	(36, 981, 000)	(35, 334, 700)	(1, 646, 300)

⁴ Estimate of cost for the 6 months the 6% retroactive pay bill would be in effect during fiscal 1970. Under the bill language, transfers of certain unobligated balances are authorized to help meet the added costs, and some absorptions otherwise are probable. Thus, the aggregate additional appropriation under this provision may actually be less than

\$1,350,000,000. Note.—In terms of the February budget aggregates for 1970, the net additional amount is \$1,175,000,000, after taking account of the \$175,000,000 allowance in the February budget total related to a postal pay raise.

TITLE IV

LIMITATION (REVISED) ON FISCAL YEAR 1970 BUDGET OUTLAYS

Title IV of the bill would update and reset the overall ceiling on government spending for the current fiscal year 1970.

The basic need for resetting the ceiling stems from underestimates of requirements in the original budget revisions (of April 15, 1969) with respect to a handful of so-called designated uncontrollable items for which the ceiling law allowed a \$2 billion "cushion". In all instances, these involve objects and programs for which the budget outlays arise out of appropriations or other authority, or relate to receipts that operate to offset budget outlays, that *do not require annual action by the Congress*—in other words, *permanent* appropriations or other spending authority contained in basic law, or actions or inactions that operate otherwise to determine budget outlays under the unified budget concept.

Other than for the overrun from miscalculations of requirements for the designated uncontrollables, spending in fiscal 1970 has been kept within the statutory ceiling. As of the date of the revised figures in the new budget (Feb. 2), the overrun for these designated uncontrollables was \$4.3 billion in relation to the April, 1969 estimates (in other words, \$2.3 billion above the \$2 billion "cushion" provided for them in the original ceiling law), as follows:

Outlay overruns to April, 1969 estimates for designated uncontrollables

[In billions of dollars]

Social insurance trust funds.....	+1.7
Interest.....	+1.4
Sales of financial assets (offsets to outlays).....	+0.9
Leases of lands, Outer Continental Shelf (offsets to outlays)...	+0.3
National service life insurance fund.....	(¹)
Farm price supports.....	(¹)
Total.....	+4.3

¹ Less than \$50 million.

Note.—The \$1.7 billion increase for social insurance trust funds *is in addition* to the \$1.7 billion increase in social security benefits voted by the Congress in the last session, which has also been reflected in the revised spending ceiling.

The Budget Director told the Committee that further changes in some of these items are already apparent. Interest on the debt for 1970, for example, is now estimated to go \$400 million above the February estimate. Others have increased, offset by some decreases. The current *net* change outlook in this limited area of items is \$300 million above the February estimate for 1970.

Other changes of course affect the current expenditure outlook for fiscal 1970 and enter into an accounting for the variation from the original overall \$192.9 billion administration spending *estimate* and the original overall \$191.9 billion spending *ceiling*. Congress made an initial cut of \$1 billion from the estimate in setting the ceiling; the administration itself submitted supplements and amendments to its original budget; Congress acted on the portions of the budget subject to annual action, making changes in both directions; Congress failed to act on several other budgetary proposals, likewise affecting the figures; normal reestimating of 1970 outlays in connection with formulating the 1971 budget also introduced some differences; and anticipated second session actions are in the picture.

The revised fiscal 1970 spending estimate in the 1971 budget (of February 2) is \$197.9 billion—\$5 billion above the original administration \$192.9 billion spending estimate and \$6 billion above the original \$191.9 billion congressional ceiling amount. Here is a capsule accounting for the differences to February 2, the date of the new budget—based on Executive Branch figures and thus ignoring classification and estimating differences of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Federal Expenditures:

[Billions]

	In relation to—	
	Original estimate	Original ceiling
Original estimate and original ceiling.....	\$192.9	\$191.9
Changes—		
1. Original blanket cut by Congress.....	-1.0	
2. Administration underestimates on designated uncontrollables (on which annual action is not required).....	+4.3	+4.3
3. Actions and inactions on original April, 1969 estimates (includes about \$1.2 billion for administration additions):		
Appropriation acts.....	-1.9	-1.9
Other acts (social security, etc.).....	+1.5	+1.5
Inactions (postal rates, sales of financial assets, etc.).....	+1.3	+1.3
Subtotal, actions and inactions.....	+0.9	+0.9
4. Anticipated 2d session actions affecting fiscal 1970 (pay raises, veterans, public assistance, etc.).....	+0.9	+0.9
5. Nominal margin in revised estimate for other spending.....	-0.1	-0.1
Net change, all factors.....	+5.0	+6.0
6. Revised 1970 spending estimate (in 1971 budget).....	197.9	197.9

THE REVISED CEILING PROPOSED IN THE BILL

For purposes of more complete disclosure and for simplicity as well as for technical reasons, the Committee has restated the full ceiling language in the bill rather than attempt to variously amend the existing ceiling law. The Executive Branch communication of March 12 had recommended essentially the latter procedure, embodying two substantive changes:

1. Removing altogether the ceiling on the "cushion" for designated uncontrollables—in view of the lack of effective controllability and the difficulties of estimating precisely.

2. Providing a \$1 billion "cushion" within the basic ceiling to provide a margin sufficient to permit prudent management in the few remaining weeks of the current fiscal year if the mark is missed on expenditure estimates for essential programs. (The proposition was to raise the existing "base" ceiling of \$191.9 billion to \$192.9 billion).

The Committee prefers to supersede the old ceiling with a new provision, setting the "base" or beginning ceiling at \$197,885,000,000 (i.e., \$197.9 billion), the revised fiscal 1970 estimate of budget outlays shown in the 1971 budget of February 2. Coupled with this would be language, like in the existing ceiling law, that would operate continuously to adjust the ceiling, as appropriate, to comport with the estimated expenditure effect of specific congressional actions or inactions having an impact on the February "base" or beginning ceiling of \$197,885,000,000. Certain completed actions and inactions already occurring in the present session would constitute a basis for adjusting this base figure. They are noted on page 760 of the printed hearings, and include the \$1.2 billion relating to the 6% retroactive pay bill.

The Budget Director, on April 13, told the Committee that the administration may be able to hold total 1970 budget outlays to \$199.1 billion but could not be certain that would result. Because of the inherent uncertainties in estimating the exact timing of budget outlays and with the possibility that a miscalculation could cause undue disruption to prudent management in the closing weeks of the fiscal year, the Committee has included a $\frac{1}{2}$ of 1 percent "cushion" providing—

"That in the event the President shall estimate and determine that total budget outlays cannot be held within the overall limitation provided herein, he may, after notification in writing to the Congress stating his reasons therefor, adjust the amount by not more than $\frac{1}{2}$ of 1 percent thereof."

The administration has pledged that it will continue its vigorous efforts to control Federal spending. Thus the primary burden will be on the President to avoid use of this latitude altogether if reasonably possible, and in any event to call upon it sparingly unless absolutely essential to do otherwise.

Rather than remove altogether—as the Executive proposes—the ceiling on the "cushion" for designated uncontrollables (i.e., a handful of items on which Congress does not annually act), the Committee has inserted a \$1,000,000,000 "cushion" for any further overruns in such items. As noted above, the Budget Director very recently advised the Committee that there is already an apparent net overrun (beyond the February 2 estimates) of about \$300,000,000, but if the administration is able to hold aggregate 1970 outlays to \$199.1 billion as they have indicated, that \$300 million would be offset by decreases elsewhere and thus not mortgage any of the \$1 billion "cushion". Based on present information, the \$1 billion "cushion" seems quite adequate as a standby authority for these designated uncontrollables.

TITLE V

LIMITATION ON FISCAL YEAR 1971 BUDGET OUTLAYS

Title V of the bill would place an overall ceiling on budget outlays of the Federal Government during the fiscal year 1971 that begins on July 1, 1970. The precise terminology is "Expenditures and net lending" which, taken together, constitute "budget outlays".

CONCEPT OF THE CEILING

The proposed ceiling for fiscal 1971 is quite similar in concept and structure to the ceiling currently applicable to the fiscal year 1970. There is, however, one major difference: Congress, in enacting the 1970 ceiling last July, imposed a blanket \$1 billion cut from the budget spending total at the outset. The proposal for 1971 in the accompanying bill makes no such cut. The Committee did not recommend any initial cut last year and does not think it appropriate to do so this year.

The Committee, in initiating an all-encompassing ceiling last year, was not seeking to advance a vehicle for arbitrary broad-axe type cutbacks that would leave to the Executive the allocation of any spending reduction to specific agencies and programs. The whole idea was to focus on the totality of Federal spending by putting the control of *total* spending in the hands of Congress, adjustable *only* by the Congress.

It is not too widely recognized that in the various annual bills affecting the budget, Congress, in respect to the \$200.8 billion fiscal 1971 spending budget, would normally deal with requests involving less than half of that spending total—about 47 percent, to be more exact. (The other 53 percent springs from unexpended carryover balances from previous years and from so-called permanent appropriations that arise automatically under earlier laws.)

By covering the annual expenditures from all sources, the ceiling focuses on the total and tends to keep it in focus. And such a ceiling affords the opportunity to force attention on possible alternatives and substitutes when upward pressures are exerted on the ceiling.

An overall ceiling, adjustable to the independent decisions of the Congress in the various bills during the year, not only provides a useful disciplinary target to guide individual actions by Congress and the Executive, but can also have some usefulness as a short-run regulating device, especially when economic and fiscal pressures are great.

THE CEILING FOR 1971

The amount specifically stated in the provision in the bill, \$200,771,000,000, is a beginning figure, not an ending figure. It is the President's initial projection of 1971 budget outlays in the Budget for 1971, submitted February 2.

Coupled with the \$200.8 billion figure is language, indential to what is in the current ceiling, providing—

** * * That whenever action, or inaction, by the Congress on requests for appropriations and other budgetary proposals varies from the President's recommendations reflected in the Budget for 1971 (H. Doc. 91-240, part 1), the Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall report to the President and to the Congress his estimate of the effect of such action or inaction on budget outlays, and the limitation set forth herein shall be correspondingly adjusted: Provided further, That the Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall report to the President and to the Congress his estimate of the effect on budget outlays of other actions by the Congress (whether initiated by the President or the Congress) and the limitation set forth herein shall be correspondingly adjusted * * **

In other words, Congress would work from the President's proposed total spending estimate. It would do so through its actions, or its inactions, on requests for appropriations and other budget obligational authority and outlay proposals in the various appropriation bills and other bills affecting budget proposals, including amendments and supplements to the February budget.

The language would operate continuously to adjust the ceiling, as appropriate, to comport with the estimated expenditure effect of specific congressional actions or inactions having budgetary impact.

It is a flexible provision—but in terms of aggregate spending, flexible only on the action of the Congress, not the Executive.

It does not seek to declare something of the end from the beginning; it sets a beginning point against which Congress would work in deciding, through its various spending actions, what the ultimate total should be, and supplies a mechanism for resetting the ceiling accordingly.

It would be the second ceiling ever to place directly in the hands of Congress the specific decision as to the maximum amounts to be taken out of the Treasury for payment of the Government's bills in a given 12-month period.

The ceiling proposed in this bill would afford opportunity for maximum flexibility within the overall total to meet, as fully as reasonably possible, changed and changing expenditure requirements in certain specific programs that cannot be foreseen with great precision. The administration is committed to continue vigorous efforts to control Federal spending. An aggregate ceiling should be facilitating in this regard.

Of course, the President can seek supplemental relief to meet necessary but unforeseen and unavoidable outlay increases which he finds cannot be accommodated within the overall total.

Setting a beginning ceiling in this fashion should in no way discourage the Executive Branch from its continuing commitment—and responsibility—for seeking to conduct the day-to-day management of government programs at the very minimum cost consistent with the public necessities, refraining from spending every dollar that can reasonably be saved. Constructive economy in public spending is not alone a matter of legislative decision. It is also a matter of administration. The administration has attached high priority to quality of

performance in administering the government. Wasteful and needless expenditures often do not become so until funds are poorly managed. The primary burden of getting a dollar's value for every dollar justifiably appropriated to the purposes of government lies mainly with those who administer, not with those who legislate.

CUSHION FOR DESIGNATED UNCONTROLLABLES

Experience in the current fiscal year 1970 clearly suggests the advisability of providing some limited "cushion" for underestimates of budget outlays in fiscal 1971 for certain so-called uncontrollable objects and programs, i.e., in a handful of cases, *where Congress does not annually act on the budgetary estimates involved*. These are mainly so-called permanent authorizations that each year *automatically* stem from various basic laws.

A "cushion" for such items, of \$2,000,000,000, was carried in the 1970 ceiling law, but already, as explained earlier in this report in connection with title IV of the bill, the overruns arising from administration miscalculations of outlay requirements approximate \$4,300,000,000, and will probably go even higher before fiscal 1970 ends.

Accordingly, the bill proposes a similar cushion for 1971—covering the same items as did the 1970 ceiling law—but puts a dollar limit of \$3,000,000,000 on how far the President can go in so adjusting the ceiling on this account. This is higher than the current year cushion but considerably less than the current year overrun. It amounts to about 1½ percent of the overall budget total and about 4½ percent of the estimates for the items involved.

The items encompassed are listed on page 49 of the Budget for 1971. They generally involve very large sums and items where it is difficult to make accurate projections. The items are:

Social security, medicare, and other social insurance trust funds;

National service life insurance (trust fund);

Interest; and

Farm price supports (Commodity Credit Corporation).

Decline of receipts (credited in the budget against expenditures and net lending) derived from—

Sales of financial assets of programs administered by the Farmers Home Administration, Export-Import Bank, agencies of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and Veterans' Administration, and

Leases of lands on the Outer Continental Shelf.

In contrast to the situation as to these designated uncontrollables on which Congress does not annually act, since the bill sets a comprehensive ceiling which would be continuously adjustable based on congressional actions or inactions on budgetary proposals whether initiated by the President or by the Congress and whether or not inside or outside the February 2 budget totals, there is no necessity to exempt any area of the budget that Congress normally acts upon each year. Approval of supplemental appropriations to meet existing *unbudgeted* requirements would also be the basis for a corresponding adjustment in the ceiling on budget outlays.

UNEXPENDED CARRYOVER BALANCES AND THE DIMENSIONS OF ANNUAL ACTIONS

The proposed ceiling provision, being all-inclusive, covers outlays in fiscal 1971 from budget authority to be newly granted in this session; outlays from so-called permanent appropriations that flow automatically from earlier laws; and outlays from unexpended carryover balances of prior years. Very substantial portions of the \$200.8 billion beginning ceiling figure spring from each of these three general sources of expenditure availability.

For example, total unexpended carryover balances at the beginning of fiscal 1971 will approximate \$234 billion—about \$108 billion in social security and other trust funds and \$126 billion in Federal funds. But some \$77 billion of the \$126 billion of Federal funds will have been obligated for programs across the government but not yet actually paid out. The remaining \$49 billion, not obligated and not expended, is in many accounts across the government.

But of the \$234 billion total beginning carryover, trust and federal funds combined, roughly \$96 billion is projected for expenditure (disbursement, that is) in fiscal 1971, and roughly that amount is thus counted in the \$200.8 billion ceiling figure. The remainder of the carryovers—some \$138 billion—becomes part of the total unexpended carryover projected into the following year, fiscal 1972.

Roughly then, it can be seen that only about \$105 billion of the newly projected outlay total for 1971 (\$200.8 billion, less the \$96 billion from carryovers) is estimated to come from the \$218 billion *net* new budget authority requested or estimated for that same year of 1971. In other words, the 1971 outlay total involves *less than half* of the new budget authority requested for 1971. Funds appropriated in a given year are expended partly in that year and partly in subsequent years because of long lead-times, construction time, and other factors.

DIMENSIONS OF ANNUAL ACTIONS ON BUDGET

Budget obligational authority (appropriations, essentially) is the traditional basis on which appropriation and authorization bills are stated and voted on regardless of the year or years in which the funds are to be actually disbursed in the form of budget outlays.

Thus the \$200.8 billion "outlay" budget for 1971 is *not* the "action" budget before the Congress. The Congress will *not* vote on that figure in the various appropriation and other spending and authorization bills relating to fiscal 1971. Congress, in these bills, will be voting on an entirely different basis—the appropriations or new budget (obligational) authority basis.

The gross total new budget (obligational) authority proposed or estimated in the February budget for 1971—and this is not as widely known as the more familiar \$200.8 billion outlay estimate—is \$234,-819,000,000, *gross*.

Of that, about \$86,706,000,000 is estimated to become available automatically without action by the Congress this session for such so-called permanent items as interest on the debt and various social insurance trust funds. That leaves roughly \$148,113,000,000 subject to Congressional action this year. That is the total in the February budget for 1971, and, like all budgets, is subject to amendments and supplements from time to time (already, for example, the President's messages of April 3 and 16, relating to pay increases and postage

rates and reform, have substantially modified the budget aggregates in some particulars).

The February budget for 1971 in respect to budget authority totals; budget outlay totals; and what is subject to annual action and what is not is capsuled in the following table using budget figures:

(In millions)

	New budget authority, 1971 budget requests (est.)	Budget outlays, 1971 (est.)
1. Proposed to be available through current actions by the Congress.....	148, 113	92, 798
2. Portion estimated to become available without current actions by the Congress (so-called permanent authorizations under laws of earlier years, such as interest on the debt, social security and other trust funds, etc.).....	86, 706	28, 826
Subtotal.....	234, 819	121, 624
3. Outlays from unexpended carryover balances of all kinds (from prior years).....		95, 935
Gross total.....	234, 819	217, 559
4. Deduct offsetting receipts (intrabudgetary transactions to avoid double counting, and "proprietary receipts from the public").....	-16, 788	-16, 788
Net totals in the 1971 budget.....	218, 031	200, 771

THE \$200.8 BILLION OUTLAY ESTIMATE FOR 1971

There have been a number of developments since submission of the February 2 budget that either constitute a basis for adjusting the \$200.8 billion outlay total upward under the flexible ceiling provision proposed in the bill or point to upward pressures on it. A number of major specifics are mentioned in the printed hearings, at pages 788-790.

Other developments of many kinds, and for many reasons, will of course take place as the session and the year progress that will bear on both the outgo and income sides of the fiscal 1971 budget. The Committee merely thought it appropriate to call attention to these major specifics mentioned in the hearings since the \$200.8 billion figure is used in the ceiling language of the accompanying bill notwithstanding the fact that things have already happened, some of which lay the basis for changes in that figure; some do not.

LIMITATIONS AND LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

The following limitations and legislative provisions not heretofore carried in connection with any appropriation bill are recommended:

On page 3, in connection with "Public Safety," District of Columbia:

The limitation on the expenditure of funds by the Chief of Police for prevention and detection of crime during the current fiscal year shall be \$100,000.

On page 5, in connection with the "Commission on Population Growth and the American Future":

Provided, That \$700,000 of the foregoing amount shall not become available without submission of a program and financial plan by the Commission and approval thereof by the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and House of Representatives.

Union Calendar No. 483

91ST CONGRESS
2^D SESSION

H. R. 17399

[Report No. 91-1033]

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

APRIL 30, 1970

Mr. MAHON, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the following bill; which was committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

A BILL

Making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending
June 30, 1970, and for other purposes.

- 1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That the following sums are appropriated out of any money

1 in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to supply supple-
2 mental appropriations (this Act may be cited as the "Second
3 Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1970") for the fiscal year
4 ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes, namely:

5 TITLE I

6 CHAPTER I

7 DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

8 EXTENSION SERVICE

9 COOPERATIVE EXTENSION WORK, PAYMENTS, AND

10 EXPENSES

11 For an additional amount for "Cooperative extension
12 work, payments and expenses" for "Retirement and em-
13 ployees' compensation costs for extension agents", not to
14 exceed \$597,000 to be derived by transfer from the appro-
15 priation for "Payments to States and Puerto Rico", fiscal
16 year 1970.

17 CHAPTER II

18 DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—MILITARY

19 RETIRED MILITARY PERSONNEL

20 RETIRED PAY, DEFENSE

21 For an additional amount for "Retired pay, Defense,"
22 \$99,000,000.

CHAPTER III

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

FEDERAL FUNDS

LOANS TO THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FOR CAPITAL
OUTLAY

For an additional amount for "Loans to the District of Columbia for capital outlay", \$1,293,000, to remain available until expended and to be advanced to the general fund upon request of the Commissioner.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FUNDS

GENERAL OPERATING EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "General operating expenses", \$2,675.

PUBLIC SAFETY

For an additional amount for "Public safety", including purchase of sixty passenger motor vehicles for police-type use which may exceed the general purchase price limitation for the current fiscal year by not in excess of \$400 per vehicle, \$2,370,500.

The limitation on the expenditure of funds by the Chief of Police for prevention and detection of crime during the current fiscal year shall be \$100,000.

PARKS AND RECREATION

For an additional amount for "Parks and recreation", \$47,300.

1 CAPITAL OUTLAY

2 For an additional amount for "Capital outlay", to remain
3 available until expended, \$1,658,000.

4 DIVISION OF EXPENSES

5 The sums appropriated herein for the District of Colum-
6 bia shall be paid out of the general fund of the District of
7 Columbia, except as otherwise specifically provided.

8 CHAPTER IV

9 FOREIGN OPERATIONS

10 FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

11 INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL INSTITUTION

12 INVESTMENT IN INTER-AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK

13 For an additional amount for subscription to the Inter-
14 American Development Bank, to remain available until ex-
15 pended, \$205,880,000, for the second of two installments
16 of the United States share in the authorized increase in call-
17 able capital stock of the Bank.

18 CHAPTER V

19 INDEPENDENT OFFICES

20 CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

21 FEDERAL LABOR RELATIONS COUNCIL

22 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

23 The limitation heretofore provided on the rate of com-
24 pensation for the public members of the Federal Service Im-
25 passes Panel is increased to a rate of not to exceed the per
26 diem rate equivalent to the rate for grade GS-18.

COMMISSION ON POPULATION GROWTH AND

THE AMERICAN FUTURE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the Commission on Population Growth and the American Future, including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, and hire of passenger motor vehicles, \$965,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That \$700,000 of the foregoing amount shall not become available without submission of a program and financial plan by the Commission and approval thereof by the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and House of Representatives.

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", \$7,000,000.

VETERANS ADMINISTRATION

COMPENSATION AND PENSIONS

For an additional amount for "Compensation and pensions", \$273,045,000, to remain available until expended.

READJUSTMENT BENEFITS

For an additional amount for "Readjustment benefits", \$327,500,000, to remain available until expended.

MEDICAL CARE

For an additional amount for "Medical care", \$109,500,000.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the Council on Environmental Quality in carrying out its functions under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (Public Law 91-190), including hire of passenger motor vehicles and partial support of the cabinet committee on environmental quality, and the Citizens' Advisory Committee on Environmental Quality, established by Executive Order 11472 of May 29, 1969, or any amendatory order, \$100,000.

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

DISASTER RELIEF

For an additional amount for "Disaster Relief", \$75,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That not to exceed 3 per centum of the foregoing amount shall be available for administrative expenses.

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN

DEVELOPMENT

RENEWAL AND HOUSING ASSISTANCE

LOW RENT PUBLIC HOUSING ANNUAL CONTRIBUTIONS

For an additional amount for "Low-rent public housing annual contributions", fiscal year 1969, \$13,616,000.

COLLEGE HOUSING

The limitation on total payments that may be required in any fiscal year by all contracts for annual grants with

1 educational institutions entered into pursuant to Section 401
2 of the Housing Act of 1950, as amended (82 Stat. 604),
3 is increased by \$5,000,000.

4 MORTGAGE CREDIT

5 FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

6 HOMEOWNERSHIP AND RENTAL HOUSING ASSISTANCE

7 The limitation on total payments that may be required
8 in any fiscal year by all contracts entered into under section
9 235 of the National Housing Act, as amended (82 Stat.
10 477), is increased by \$35,000,000, and the limitation on
11 total payments under those entered into under section 236
12 of such Act (82 Stat. 498), is increased by \$35,000,000.

13 CHAPTER VI

14 DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

15 BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

16 MANAGEMENT OF LANDS AND RESOURCES

17 For an additional amount for "Management of lands and
18 resources," \$23,790,000.

19 BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

20 RESOURCES MANAGEMENT

21 For an additional amount for "Resources management,"
22 \$700,000.

23 BUREAU OF OUTDOOR RECREATION

24 LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION

25 For an additional amount for "Land and Water Con-
26 servation," to remain available until expended, \$7,100,000,

1 to be derived from the Land and Water Conservation Fund,
2 and to be available to the National Park Service for property
3 acquisition authorized by the act of September 13, 1962
4 (Public Law 87-657), as amended.

5 OFFICE OF TERRITORIES

6 ADMINISTRATION OF TERRITORIES

7 For an additional amount for "Administration of Ter-
8 ritories," \$275,000, to remain available until expended.

9 NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

10 MANAGEMENT AND PROTECTION

11 For an additional amount for "Management and Pro-
12 tection," \$850,000.

13 RELATED AGENCIES

14 DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

15 FOREST SERVICE

16 FOREST PROTECTION AND UTILIZATION

17 For an additional amount for "Forest protection and
18 utilization," for "Forest land management", \$21,000,000.

1 NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE
2 HUMANITIES

3 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

4 In addition to amounts heretofore appropriated under
5 this heading there are appropriated amounts equal to the
6 total amount of gifts, bequests, and devises of money, and
7 other property received by each Endowment, during the cur-
8 rent and preceding fiscal years, under the provisions of sec-
9 tion 10 (a) (2) of the National Foundation on the Arts and
10 Humanities Act of 1965, as amended, but not to exceed a
11 total of \$2,000,000, to remain available until expended.

12 CHAPTER VII

13 DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

14 BUREAU OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY

15 UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

16 AND EX-SERVICEMEN

17 For an additional amount for "Unemployment compensa-
18 tion for Federal employees and ex-servicemen", \$50,000,000.

1 LIMITATION ON GRANTS TO STATES FOR UNEMPLOYMENT
2 COMPENSATION AND EMPLOYMENT SERVICE ADMINIS-
3 TRATION

4 For an additional amount for "Limitation on grants to
5 States for unemployment compensation and employment
6 service administration", \$10,000,000, to be expended from
7 the employment security administration account in the
8 Unemployment Trust fund.

9 WAGE AND LABOR STANDARDS ADMINISTRATION

10 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

11 For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses",
12 \$37,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$43,000 may be
13 transferred from the amounts herein and heretofore appro-
14 priated for "Salaries and expenses" for the current fiscal year
15 to the fund created by section 44 of the Longshoremen's and
16 Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, as amended.

17 OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

18 FEDERAL CONTRACT COMPLIANCE AND CIVIL RIGHTS
19 PROGRAM

20 For an additional amount for "Federal contract compli-
21 ance and civil rights program, salaries and expenses",
22 \$107,000.

1 DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND
2 WELFARE

3 SOCIAL AND REHABILITATION SERVICE

4 GRANTS TO STATES FOR PUBLIC ASSISTANCE

5 For an additional amount for "Grants to States for
6 public assistance," \$146,753,000.

7 SPECIAL INSTITUTIONS

8 HOWARD UNIVERSITY

9 CONSTRUCTION

10 For an additional amount for "Construction", \$7,700,-
11 000, to remain available until expended.

12 CHAPTER VIII

13 LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

14 HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

15 SALARIES, MILEAGE FOR THE MEMBERS, AND EXPENSE

16 ALLOWANCE OF THE SPEAKER

17 COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS

18 For an additional amount for "Compensation of mem-
19 bers", \$47,000.

20 SALARIES, OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

21 COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

22 For an additional amount for "Committee on Appro-
23 priations", \$35,555.

1 CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE HOUSE

2 MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS

3 For an additional amount for "Miscellaneous items",
4 \$50,000.

5 SPECIAL AND SELECT COMMITTEES

6 For an additional amount for "Special and select com-
7 mittees", \$100,000, to remain available until expended under
8 the provisions of House Resolution 710, Ninety-first
9 Congress.

10 GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

11 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

12 For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses",
13 \$499,000.

14 CHAPTER IX

15 PUBLIC WORKS

16 DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

17 BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

18 COLORADO RIVER BASIN PROJECT

19 For an additional amount for "Colorado River Basin
20 Project", to remain available until expended, \$6,563,000,
21 to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Con-
22 struction and rehabilitation".

CHAPTER X

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND CONFERENCES

CONTRIBUTIONS TO INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

For an additional amount for "Contributions to international organizations", \$1,600,000.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses, Immigration and Naturalization Service", \$892,000.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

NINETEENTH DECENNIAL CENSUS

For an additional amount for the "Nineteenth decennial census", \$11,000,000, to remain available until December 31, 1972.

OFFICE OF FIELD SERVICES

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", \$105,000.

THE JUDICIARY

CUSTOMS COURT

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses",
\$18,000.

COURTS OF APPEALS, DISTRICT COURTS, AND OTHER
JUDICIAL SERVICES

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, UNITED STATES MAGISTRATES

For "Salaries and expenses, United States magistrates",
\$550,000.

FEES AND EXPENSES OF COURT-APPOINTED COUNSEL

For an additional amount for "Fees and expenses of
court-appointed counsel", \$1,150,000.

For an additional amount for "Fees and expenses of
court-appointed counsel", \$300,000, fiscal year 1969.

FEES OF JURORS AND COMMISSIONERS

For an additional amount for "Fees of jurors and com-
missioners", \$500,000.

TRAVEL AND MISCELLANEOUS EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Travel and miscellaneous
expenses", \$500,000.

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES COURTS

For an additional amount for "Administrative Office of
the United States Courts", \$15,000.

1 RELATED AGENCIES

2 OFFICE OF EDUCATION

3 CIVIL RIGHTS EDUCATION

4 For an additional amount for "Civil Rights Education",
5 including not to exceed \$250,000 for salaries and expenses,
6 \$5,000,000.

7 CHAPTER XI

8 DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

9 COAST GUARD

10 RETIRED PAY

11 For an additional amount for "Retired pay", \$1,250,-
12 000.

13 RELATED AGENCY

14 WASHINGTON METROPOLITAN AREA TRANSIT AUTHORITY

15 FEDERAL CONTRIBUTION

16 For an additional amount for "Federal contribution",
17 to enable the Department of Transportation to pay the
18 Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority an addi-
19 tional contribution for the rail rapid transit system, as au-
20 thorized by the National Capital Transportation Act of 1969,
21 (Public Law 91-143), \$82,939,000, to remain available
22 until expended.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

CHAPTER XII

TREASURY DEPARTMENT

BUREAU OF THE PUBLIC DEBT

ADMINISTERING THE PUBLIC DEBT

For an additional amount for “Administering the public debt”, \$3,250,000.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

(Out of Postal Fund)

TRANSPORTATION

For an additional amount for “Transportation”, \$10,-
700,000.

RELATED AGENCIES

TAX COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for “Salaries and expenses”,
\$83,000.

CHAPTER XIII

CLAIMS AND JUDGMENTS

For payment of claims settled and determined by departments and agencies in accord with law and judgments rendered against the United States by the United States Court of Claims and United States district courts, as set forth in House Document Numbered 91-315, Ninety-first Congress, \$6,591,406, together with such amounts as may be necessary to pay interest (as and when specified in such

1 judgments or provided by law) and such additional sums
 2 due to increases in rates of exchange as may be necessary to
 3 pay claims in foreign currency: *Provided*, That no judgment
 4 herein appropriated for shall be paid until it shall become
 5 final and conclusive against the United States by failure of
 6 the parties to appeal or otherwise: *Provided further*, That
 7 unless otherwise specifically required by law or by judgment,
 8 payment of interest wherever appropriated for herein shall
 9 not continue for more than thirty days after the date of
 10 approval of the Act.

11 TITLE II

12 INCREASED PAY COSTS

13 For additional amounts for appropriations for the fiscal
 14 year 1970, for increased pay costs authorized by or pursuant
 15 to law, as follows:

16 LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

17 HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

18 "Office of the Parliamentarian", \$10,865;

19 "Compilation of precedents of House of Representa-
 20 tives", \$1,330;

21 "Office of the Chaplain", \$1,805;

22 "Office of the Clerk", \$100,000;

23 "Office of the Sergeant at Arms", \$250,000;

24 "Office of the Doorkeeper", \$120,000;

25 "Office of the Postmaster", \$62,900;

1 “Committee employees”, \$700,000;

2 Special and minority employees:

3 “House Democratic steering committee”, \$1,310;

4 “House Republican conference”, \$1,310;

5 “Majority leader”, \$8,135;

6 “Minority leader”, \$7,265;

7 “Majority whip”, \$5,525;

8 “Minority whip”, \$5,525;

9 “Official reporters of debates”, \$32,605;

10 “Official reporters to committees”, \$32,370;

11 “Committee on Appropriations”, \$89,445;

12 “Office of the legislative counsel”, \$23,400;

13 “Members’ clerk hire”, \$850,000;

14 Contingent expenses of the House:

15 “Government contributions”, \$760,000, and in
16 addition such amount as may be necessary may be
17 transferred from the appropriation for “miscellane-
18 ous items”;

19 “Speaker’s automobile”, \$1,500;

20 “Majority leader’s automobile”, \$1,500;

21 “Minority leader’s automobile”, \$1,500;

22 Joint items:

23 Contingent expenses of the Senate:

24 “Joint Economic Committee”, \$44,490;

1 “Joint Committee on Atomic Energy”,
2 \$32,460;

3 “Joint Committee on Printing”, \$15,175;

4 Contingent expenses of the House:

5 “Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Tax-
6 ation”, \$10,065;

7 “Joint Committee on Defense Production”,
8 \$10,850;

9 ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

10 Office of the Architect of the Capitol: “Salaries”,
11 \$56,000.

12 Capitol buildings and grounds:

13 “Capitol buildings”, \$55,500;

14 “Capitol grounds”, \$28,200;

15 “House office buildings”, \$120,000;

16 “Capitol power plant”, \$20,800;

17 Library buildings and grounds: “Structural and me-
18 chanical care”, \$10,000.

19 BOTANIC GARDEN

20 “Salaries and expenses”, \$24,000;

21 LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

22 “Salaries and expenses”, \$1,313,500;

23 Copyright Office: “Salaries and expenses”, \$274,000;

24 Legislative Reference Service: “Salaries and expenses”,
25 \$414,000;

1 Distribution of catalog cards: "Salaries and expenses",
 2 \$159,000, and in addition the reserve fund of \$200,000
 3 under this head, fiscal year 1970, may be used for increased
 4 pay costs;

5 Books for the blind and physically handicapped: "Sal-
 6 aries and expenses", \$33,000;

7 Organizing and microfilming the papers of the Presi-
 8 dents: "Salaries and expenses", \$13,200;

9 "Collection and distribution of library materials (special
 10 foreign currency program) ", \$14,000;

11 GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

12 Office of Superintendent of Documents: "Salaries and
 13 expenses", \$395,400, and in addition the reserve fund of
 14 \$200,000 under this head, fiscal year 1970, may be used
 15 for pay costs;

16 GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

17 "Salaries and expenses", \$5,142,000;

18 THE JUDICIARY

19 SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

20 "Salaries", \$194,000;

21 "Care of the building and grounds", \$21,700;

22 COURT OF CUSTOMS AND PATENT APPEALS

23 "Salaries and expenses", \$22,000;

24 CUSTOMS COURT

25 "Salaries and expenses", \$128,500;

1 COURTS OF APPEALS, DISTRICT COURTS, AND OTHER

2 JUDICIAL SERVICES

3 “Salaries of supporting personnel”, \$4,370,000;

4 “Administrative Office of the United States Courts”,

5 \$190,000, of which \$20,000 shall be derived by transfer

6 from the appropriation for “Expenses of referees”;

7 “Expenses of referees”, \$608,000;

8 EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

9 The White House Office: “Salaries and expenses”,

10 \$310,000;

11 “Operating expenses, Executive Mansion”, \$48,000;

12 BUREAU OF THE BUDGET

13 “Salaries and expenses”, \$491,000;

14 COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS

15 “Salaries and expenses”, \$50,000;

16 NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE COUNCIL

17 “Salaries and expenses”, \$49,000;

18 OFFICE OF EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS

19 “Salaries and expenses”, \$290,000;

20 SPECIAL REPRESENTATIVE FOR TRADE NEGOTIATIONS

21 “Salaries and expenses”, \$51,000;

22 FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

23 PEACE CORPS

24 “Salaries and expenses”: (Increase of \$1,651,000 in

25 the limitation on administrative expenses) ;

1 FOREIGN ASSISTANCE: ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE

2 "Administrative expenses", \$3,200,000, to be derived
3 by transfer from appropriations for "Economic assistance",
4 fiscal year 1970;

5 "Administrative and other expenses": \$200,000, to be
6 derived by transfer from appropriations for "Economic as-
7 sistance", fiscal year 1970;

8 DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

9 AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH SERVICE

10 "Salaries and expenses", for "Research", \$8,381,000,
11 and for "Plant and animal disease and pest control",
12 \$5,119,000;

13 COOPERATIVE STATE RESEARCH SERVICE

14 "Payments and expenses", \$130,000;

15 EXTENSION SERVICE

16 "Cooperative extension work, payments and expenses",
17 for "Federal Extension Service", \$250,000;

18 FARMER COOPERATIVE SERVICE

19 "Salaries and expenses", \$131,000;

20 SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

21 "Conservation operations", \$9,450,000;

22 "River basin surveys and investigations", \$652,000, to
23 remain available until expended;

24 "Watershed planning", \$491,000, to remain available
25 until expended;

1 “Watershed works of improvement”, \$2,159,000, to re-
2 main available until expended;

3 “Flood prevention”, \$815,000, to remain available
4 until expended;

5 “Great plains conservation program”, \$342,000, to re-
6 main available until expended;

7 “Resource conservation and development”, \$573,000,
8 to remain available until expended;

9 ECONOMIC RESEARCH SERVICE

10 “Salaries and expenses”, \$1,142,000;

11 STATISTICAL REPORTING SERVICE

12 “Salaries and expenses”, \$1,116,000;

13 CONSUMER AND MARKETING SERVICE

14 “Consumer protective, marketing, and regulatory pro-
15 grams”, \$5,250,000;

16 FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL SERVICE

17 “Salaries and expenses”, \$600,000;

18 COMMODITY EXCHANGE AUTHORITY

19 “Salaries and expenses”, \$170,000;

20 AGRICULTURAL STABILIZATION AND CONSERVATION
21 SERVICE

22 “Expenses, Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation
23 Service”, \$7,899,000, of which \$600,000 shall be derived
24 by transfer from the appropriation for “Conservation re-

1 serve program", fiscal year 1970, and \$1,299,000 from the
2 Commodity Credit Corporation Fund;

3 OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

4 "Salaries and expenses", \$1,022,000;

5 PACKERS AND STOCKYARDS ADMINISTRATION

6 "Salaries and expenses", \$154,000;

7 OFFICE OF THE GENERAL COUNSEL

8 "Salaries and expenses", \$427,000;

9 OFFICE OF INFORMATION

10 "Salaries and expenses", \$150,000;

11 NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL LIBRARY

12 "Salaries and expenses", \$175,000;

13 OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT SERVICES

14 "Salaries and expenses", \$237,000;

15 GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

16 "Salaries and expenses", \$425,000;

17 RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

18 "Salaries and expenses", \$1,075,000;

19 FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION

20 "Salaries and expenses", \$5,200,000;

21 FOREST SERVICE

22 "Forest protection and utilization", \$10,266,000;

23 FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE CORPORATION

24 "Administrative and operating expenses", \$691,000,

25 which may be paid from premium income;

1 DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

2 GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

3 “Salaries and expenses”, \$604,000;

4 OFFICE OF BUSINESS ECONOMICS

5 “Salaries and expenses,” \$238,000;

6 BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

7 “Salaries and expenses”, \$1,141,000;

8 “Nineteenth decennial census”, \$6,722,000, to remain
9 available until December 31, 1972;10 “1967 economic censuses”, \$282,000, to remain avail-
11 able until December 31, 1970;

12 ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION

13 “Operations and administration”, \$1,121,000;

14 BUSINESS AND DEFENSE SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

15 “Salaries and expenses”, \$505,000;

16 INTERNATIONAL ACTIVITIES

17 “Salaries and expenses”, \$835,000;

18 “Export control”, \$446,000;

19 OFFICE OF FIELD SERVICES

20 “Salaries and expenses”, \$389,000;

21 MINORITY BUSINESS ENTERPRISE

22 “Salaries and expenses”, \$94,000;

23 FOREIGN DIRECT INVESTMENT CONTROL

24 “Salaries and expenses”, \$100,000;

1 ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCE SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

2 "Salaries and expenses", \$8,040,000;

3 "Research and development", \$1,239,000, to remain
4 available until expended;5 "Satellite operations", \$421,000, to remain available un-
6 til expended;

7 PATENT OFFICE

8 "Salaries and expenses", \$3,135,000;

9 NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS

10 "Research and technical services", \$2,187,000;

11 MARITIME ADMINISTRATION

12 "Salaries and expenses", for administrative expenses,
13 \$746,000;

14 "Maritime training", \$204,000;

15 DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—MILITARY

16 MILITARY PERSONNEL

17 "Military personnel, Army", \$538,000,000;

18 "Military personnel, Navy", \$360,000,000;

19 "Military personnel, Marine Corps", \$123,300,000;

20 "Military personnel, Air Force", \$485,000,000;

21 "Reserve personnel, Army", \$22,900,000;

22 "Reserve personnel, Navy", \$6,000,000;

23 "Reserve personnel, Marine Corps", \$4,000,000;

24 "National Guard personnel, Army", \$33,500,000;

25 "National Guard personnel, Air Force", \$10,000,000;

1 RETIRED MILITARY PERSONNEL

2 “Retired pay, Defense”, \$25,000,000;

3 OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

4 “Operation and maintenance, Army”, \$196,480,000;

5 “Operation and maintenance, Navy”, \$157,800,000;

6 “Operation and maintenance, Marine Corps”, \$7,000,-
7 000;

8 “Operation and maintenance, Air Force”, \$84,200,000;

9 “Operation and maintenance, Defense agencies”, \$70,-
10 400,000;

11 “Operation and maintenance, Army National Guard”,
12 \$13,800,000;

13 “Operation and maintenance, Air National Guard”,
14 \$12,250,000;

15 “Court of Military Appeals”, \$70,000;

16 CIVIL DEFENSE

17 “Operation and maintenance”, \$850,000;

18 DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

19 DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

20 CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

21 “Operation and maintenance, general”, \$6,905,000;

22 “General expenses”, \$2,000,000;

23 RYUKYU ISLANDS, ARMY

24 “Administration”, \$200,000;

1 U.S. SOLDIERS' HOME

2 "Operation and maintenance", \$296,000;

3 THE PANAMA CANAL

4 CANAL ZONE GOVERNMENT

5 "Operating expenses", \$963,000;

6 PANAMA CANAL COMPANY

7 "Limitation on general and administrative expenses",

8 (Increase of \$605,000 in the limitation on general and ad-

9 ministrative expenses) ;

10 DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND

11 WELFARE

12 CONSUMER PROTECTION AND ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH

13 SERVICE

14 "Food and drug control", \$2,294,000, to be derived by

15 transfer from the appropriation for "Health services research

16 and development", fiscal year 1970;

17 "Air pollution control", \$1,062,000, to be derived by

18 transfer from the appropriation for "Comprehensive health

19 planning and services", fiscal year 1970;

20 "Environmental control", \$757,000, to be derived by

21 transfer from the appropriation for "Regional medical pro-

22 grams", fiscal year 1970;

23 "Office of the Administrator, salaries and expenses",

24 \$354,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation

25 for "National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases",

26 fiscal year 1970;

1 HEALTH SERVICES AND MENTAL HEALTH

2 ADMINISTRATION

3 “Mental health”, \$358,000, to be derived by transfer
4 from the appropriation for “National Institute of Allergy and
5 Infectious Diseases”, fiscal year 1970;

6 “Saint Elizabeths Hospital”, \$2,519,000, to be derived
7 by transfer from the appropriation for “National Institute of
8 Neurological Diseases and Stroke”, fiscal year 1970;

9 “Communicable diseases”, \$2,446,000, to be derived by
10 transfer from the appropriation for “Maternal and child
11 health and welfare”, fiscal year 1970;

12 “Hospital construction”, \$208,000, to be derived by
13 transfer from the appropriation for “National Institute of
14 Arthritis and Metabolic Diseases”, fiscal year 1970;

15 “Patient care and special health services”, \$5,241,000,
16 to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for “National
17 Institute of Arthritis and Metabolic Diseases”, fiscal year
18 1970;

19 “National health statistics”, \$329,000, to be derived by
20 transfer from the appropriation for “National Institute of
21 Arthritis and Metabolic Diseases”, fiscal year 1970;

22 “Indian health services”, \$4,464,000, to be derived by
23 transfer from the appropriation for “National Institute of
24 General Medical Sciences”, fiscal year 1970;

25 “Office of the Administrator, salaries and expenses”,

1 \$691,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation
2 for "National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Stroke",
3 fiscal year 1970;

4 NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

5 "Office of the Director, Salaries and expenses", \$218,-
6 000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for
7 "National Institute of General Medical Sciences", fiscal year
8 1970;

9 OFFICE OF EDUCATION

10 "School assistance in federally affected areas", \$14,000,
11 to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Re-
12 search and training, Office of Education", fiscal year 1970;

13 "Libraries and community services", \$300,000, to be
14 derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Research
15 and training, Office of Education", fiscal year 1970;

16 "Salaries and expenses", \$2,528,000, to be derived by
17 transfer from the appropriation for "Research and training,
18 Office of Education", fiscal year 1970;

19 SOCIAL AND REHABILITATION SERVICE

20 "Salaries and expenses", \$2,496,000, to be derived by
21 transfer from the appropriation for "National Institute of
22 Allergy and Infectious Diseases", fiscal year 1970;

23 "Assistance to refugees in the United States", \$90,000,
24 to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Na-

1 tional Institute of Neurological Diseases and Stroke”, fiscal
2 year 1970;

3 SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

4 “Limitation on salaries and expenses (trust fund)” (In-
5 crease of \$21,276,000 in the limitation on “Salaries and ex-
6 penses”);

7 SPECIAL INSTITUTIONS

8 “Model Secondary School for the Deaf, salaries and ex-
9 penses”, \$12,000, to be derived by transfer from the appro-
10 priation for “National Institute of Neurological Diseases and
11 Stroke”, fiscal year 1970;

12 “Gallaudet College, salaries and expenses”, \$162,000,
13 to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for “Na-
14 tional Institute of Neurological Diseases and Stroke”, fiscal
15 year 1970;

16 “Howard University, salaries and expenses”, \$664,000,
17 to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for “Com-
18 prehensive health planning and services”, fiscal year 1970;

19 “Freedmen’s Hospital”, \$766,000, to be derived by
20 transfer from the appropriation for “comprehensive health
21 planning and services”, fiscal year 1970;

22 DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT

23 “Office of the Secretary, salaries and expenses”,
24 \$451,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation

1 for "Comprehensive health planning and services", fiscal
2 year 1970;

3 "Office for Civil Rights, salaries and expenses", \$496,-
4 000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for
5 "Comprehensive health planning and services", fiscal year
6 1970;

7 "Office of Community and Field Services, salaries and
8 expenses", \$607,000, to be derived by transfer from the
9 appropriation for "Comprehensive health planning and serv-
10 ices", fiscal year 1970;

11 "Office of the Comptroller, salaries and expenses",
12 \$1,018,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropria-
13 tion for "Comprehensive health planning and services", fiscal
14 year 1970;

15 "Office of the Administrator, salaries and expenses",
16 \$476,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation
17 for "Comprehensive health planning and services", fiscal
18 year 1970;

19 "Surplus property utilization", \$107,000, to be derived
20 by transfer from the appropriation for "Comprehensive
21 health planning and services", fiscal year 1970;

22 "Office of the General Counsel, salaries and expenses",
23 \$337,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation
24 for "Comprehensive health planning and services", fiscal
25 year 1970;

1 DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN
2 DEVELOPMENT

3 RENEWAL AND HOUSING ASSISTANCE

4 "Salaries and expenses", \$2,508,000;

5 METROPOLITAN DEVELOPMENT

6 "Salaries and expenses", \$480,700;

7 MODEL CITIES AND GOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

8 "Salaries and expenses", \$27,600, together with not to
9 exceed \$400,900, to be derived by transfer from the appro-
10 priation for "Model cities programs" fiscal year 1970;

11 FEDERAL INSURANCE ADMINISTRATION

12 "Flood insurance", \$28,500;

13 FAIR HOUSING AND EQUAL OPPORTUNITY

14 "Fair housing and equal opportunity", \$391,400.

15 DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT

16 "General administration", \$559,500;

17 "Regional management and services", \$655,000;

18 "Limitation on administrative expenses, college housing
19 loans" (Increase of \$75,000 in the limitation on administra-
20 tive expenses) ;

21 "Limitation on administrative expenses, public facility
22 loans" (Increase of \$55,000 in the limitation on adminis-
23 trative expenses) ;

24 "Limitation on administrative expenses, revolving fund

1 (liquidating programs) ” (Increase of \$6,700 in the limita-
 2 tion on administrative expenses) ;

3 “Limitation on administrative and nonadministrative ex-
 4 penses, Federal housing administration” (Increase of \$450,-
 5 000 in the limitation on administrative expenses and increase
 6 of \$5,175,000 in the limitation on nonadministrative ex-
 7 penses) ;

8 DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

9 BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

10 “Management of lands and resources”, \$3,498,000;

11 BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

12 “Education and welfare services”, \$9,799,000;

13 “Resources management”, \$4,378,000;

14 “General administrative expenses”, \$500,000;

15 BUREAU OF OUTDOOR RECREATION

16 “Salaries and expenses”, \$200,000;

17 GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

18 “Surveys, investigations, and research”, \$3,310,000;

19 BUREAU OF MINES

20 “Conservation and development of mineral resources”,
 21 \$3,164,000;

22 “Health and safety”, \$1,120,000;

23 “General administrative expenses”, \$152,000;

24 OFFICE OF OIL AND GAS

25 “Salaries and expenses”, \$91,000;

BUREAU OF COMMERCIAL FISHERIES

“Management and investigations of resources”, \$936,000;

“Federal aid for commercial fisheries research and development”, \$13,000;

“Anadromous and Great Lakes fisheries conservation”, \$11,000;

“General administrative expenses”, \$131,000;

“Administration of Pribilof Islands”, \$120,000, to be derived from the Pribilof Islands fund;

“Limitation on administrative expenses, fisheries loan fund” (Increase of \$25,000 in the limitation on administrative expenses) ;

BUREAU OF SPORT FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE

“Management and investigations of resources”, \$3,363,000;

“General administrative expenses”, \$176,000;

“Anadromous and Great Lakes fisheries conservation”, \$17,000;

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

“Management and protection”, \$3,359,000;

“Maintenance and rehabilitation of physical facilities”, \$1,346,000;

“General administrative expenses”, \$263,000;

“Preservation of historic properties”, \$40,000;

1 BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

2 "General investigations", \$900,000;

3 "Operation and maintenance", \$1,870,000;

4 "General administrative expenses", \$970,000;

5 BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION

6 "Operation and maintenance", \$800,000;

7 SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

8 "Operation and maintenance", \$155,000;

9 OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR

10 "Salaries and expenses", \$374,000;

11 OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

12 "Salaries and expenses", \$702,000;

13 OFFICE OF WATER RESOURCES RESEARCH

14 "Salaries and expenses", \$52,000;

15 DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

16 LEGAL ACTIVITIES AND GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

17 "Salaries and expenses, general administration", \$634,-
18 000;19 "Salaries and expenses, general legal activities", \$2,-
20 264,000;

21 "Salaries and expenses, Antitrust Division", \$769,000;

22 "Salaries and expenses, United States attorneys and
23 marshals", \$3,824,000;24 "Salaries and expenses, Community Relations Service",
25 \$230,000;

1 FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

2 “Salaries and expenses”, \$17,455,000;

3 IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE

4 “Salaries and expenses”, \$7,452,000;

5 FEDERAL PRISON SYSTEM

6 “Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Prisons”, \$5,109,000;

7 BUREAU OF NARCOTICS AND DANGEROUS DRUGS

8 “Salaries and expenses”, \$1,530,000;

9 DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

10 MANPOWER ADMINISTRATION

11 “Manpower development and training activities”, \$145,-
12 000, of which \$100,000 shall be derived by transfer from
13 the appropriation for “Office of Manpower Administrator,
14 salaries and expenses”, fiscal year 1970;

15 “Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training, salaries and
16 expenses”, \$343,000;

17 “Bureau of Employment Security, salaries and ex-
18 penses”, \$1,408,000, to be expended from the Employ-
19 ment Security Administration account in the Unemploy-
20 ment Trust Fund;

21 LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS

22 “Labor-Management Services Administration, salaries
23 and expenses”, \$805,000;

1 WAGE AND LABOR STANDARDS

2 “Wage and Labor Standards Administration, salaries
3 and expenses”, \$713,000;

4 “Wage and Hour Division, salaries and expenses”,
5 \$1,440,000;

6 BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS

7 “Salaries and expenses”, \$1,693,000;

8 BUREAU OF INTERNATIONAL LABOR AFFAIRS

9 “Salaries and expenses”, \$130,000;

10 OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR

11 “Salaries and expenses”, \$438,000; and, in addition,
12 \$13,000 to be derived from the Employment Security Ad-
13 ministration account, Unemployment Trust Fund;

14 OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

15 “Salaries and expenses”, \$515,000; and, in addition,
16 \$36,000 to be derived from the Employment Security Ad-
17 ministration account, Unemployment Trust Fund;

18 OFFICE OF FEDERAL CONTRACT COMPLIANCE AND

19 CIVIL RIGHTS PROGRAM

20 “Salaries and expenses”, \$56,000; and, in addition,
21 \$53,000 to be derived from the Employment Security Ad-
22 ministration account, Unemployment Trust Fund;

1 POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

2 (OUT OF THE POSTAL FUND)

3 "Administration and regional operation"; \$10,715,000;

4 "Research, development, and engineering", \$898,000;

5 to remain available until expended;

6 "Operations", \$261,956,000;

7 "Supplies and services", \$215,000;

8 DEPARTMENT OF STATE

9 ADMINISTRATION OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS

10 "Salaries and expenses," \$13,400,000;

11 "Acquisition, operation, and maintenance of buildings
12 abroad," \$177,000, to remain available until expended;

13 INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND CONFERENCES

14 "Missions to international organizations," \$340,000;

15 INTERNATIONAL COMMISSIONS

16 INTERNATIONAL BOUNDARY AND WATER COMMISSION,

17 UNITED STATES AND MEXICO

18 "Salaries and expenses," \$81,000;

19 "Operation and maintenance," \$175,000;

20 "American sections, international commissions," \$42,-
21 000;

22 "International fisheries commissions," \$56,000;

1 EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE

2 "Mutual educational and cultural exchange activities,"

3 \$700,000;

4 OTHER

5 "Migration and refugee assistance," \$60,000;

6 DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

7 OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

8 "Salaries and expenses", \$720,000;

9 COAST GUARD

10 "Operating expenses", \$21,675,000;

11 "Reserve training", \$1,000,000;

12 FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION

13 "Operations", \$58,597,000;

14 "Operation and maintenance, National Capital airports",

15 \$400,000;

16 FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION

17 "Office of the Administrator, salaries and expenses",

18 \$132,000 (together with an increase of \$941,000 in the

19 amount to be transferred from the appropriation for "Fed-

20 eral-aid Highways trust fund") ;

21 "Traffic and highway safety", \$600,000;

22 "Motor carrier safety", \$173,000;

23 "Bureau of Public Roads, limitation on general ex-

24 penses" (Increase of \$3,081,000 in the limitation on ad-

25 ministrative expenses to be paid from the appropriation for

26 the "Federal-aid highways trust fund") ;

FEDERAL RAILROAD ADMINISTRATION

“Office of the Administrator, salaries and expenses”,

\$85,000;

“Bureau of Railroad Safety”, \$270,000;

URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ADMINISTRATION

“Salaries and expenses”, \$100,000;

SAINT LAWRENCE SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

“Limitation on administrative expenses” (Increase of

\$52,000 in the limitation on administrative expenses) ;

NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD

“Salaries and expenses”, \$350,000;

TREASURY DEPARTMENT

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

“Salaries and expenses”, \$628,000;

BUREAU OF ACCOUNTS

“Salaries and expenses”, \$400,000;

BUREAU OF CUSTOMS

“Salaries and expenses”, \$8,830,000;

BUREAU OF THE MINT

“Salaries and expenses”, \$500,000;

BUREAU OF THE PUBLIC DEBT

“Administering the public debt”, \$1,444,000;

INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE

“Salaries and expenses”, \$1,846,000;

“Revenue accounting and processing”, \$11,920,000;

“Compliance”, \$46,291,000;

1 OFFICE OF THE TREASURER

2 “Salaries and expenses”, \$523,000;

3 UNITED STATES SECRET SERVICE

4 “Salaries and expenses”, \$1,740,000;

5 ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

6 “Operating expenses”, \$5,000,000;

7 GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

8 “Operating expenses, Public Buildings Service”,
9 \$7,222,000;

10 “Operating expenses, Federal Supply Service”,
11 \$4,431,000;

12 “Operating expenses, National Archives and Records
13 Service”, \$1,635,000;

14 “Operating expenses, Transportation and Communica-
15 tions Service”, \$528,000;

16 “Operating expenses, Property Management and Dis-
17 posal Service”, \$796,000;

18 “Salaries and expenses, Office of Administrator”,
19 \$71,000;

20 NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE

21 ADMINISTRATION

22 “Research and program management”, \$38,000,000;

23 VETERANS ADMINISTRATION

24 “Medical and prosthetic research”, \$2,983,000;

25 “Medical administration and miscellaneous operating
26 expenses”, \$955,000;

“General operating expenses”, \$15,835,000;

OTHER INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

AMERICAN BATTLE MONUMENTS COMMISSION

“Salaries and expenses”, \$77,000;

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

“Salaries and expenses”, \$900,000;

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

“Salaries and expenses”, \$2,354,000;

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION

“Salaries and expenses”, \$900,000;

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF THE UNITED STATES

“Limitation on administrative expenses” (Increase of \$400,000 in the limitation on administrative expenses) ;

FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

“Limitation on administrative expenses” (Increase of \$215,000 in the limitation on administrative expenses) ;

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

“Salaries and expenses”, \$1,700,000;

FEDERAL FIELD COMMITTEE FOR DEVELOPMENT

PLANNING IN ALASKA

“Salaries and expenses”, \$21,000;

FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

“Limitation on administrative and nonadministrative expenses, Federal Home Loan Bank Board” (Increase of \$412,000 in the limitation on administrative expenses, and

1 increase of \$325,000 in the limitation on nonadministrative
2 expenses) ;

3 "Limitation on administrative expenses, Federal Savings
4 and Loan Insurance Corporation" (Increase of \$24,000 in
5 the limitation on administrative expenses) ;

6 FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION

7 "Salaries and expenses", \$228,000;

8 FEDERAL MEDIATION AND CONCILIATION SERVICE

9 "Salaries and expenses", \$615,000;

10 FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

11 "Salaries and expenses", \$1,300,000;

12 FEDERAL RADIATION COUNCIL

13 "Salaries and expenses", \$8,000;

14 FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

15 "Salaries and expenses", \$1,000,000;

16 FOREIGN CLAIMS SETTLEMENT COMMISSION

17 "Salaries and expenses", \$56,000;

18 HISTORICAL AND MEMORIAL COMMISSIONS

19 American Revolution Bicentennial Commission:

20 "Salaries and expenses", \$10,000;

21 INTER-AGENCY COMMITTEE ON MEXICAN-AMERICAN
22 AFFAIRS

23 "Salaries and expenses", \$27,000;

1 INTERGOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES

2 ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL

3 RELATIONS

4 "Salaries and expenses", \$45,000;

5 INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

6 "Salaries and expenses", \$1,900,000;

7 NATIONAL CAPITAL PLANNING COMMISSION

8 "Salaries and expenses", \$25,000;

9 NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE

10 HUMANITIES

11 "Salaries and expenses", \$120,000;

12 NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

13 "Salaries and expenses", \$1,642,000;

14 NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

15 "Salaries and expenses", \$127,000;

16 PRESIDENT'S COMMITTEE ON CONSUMER INTERESTS

17 "Salaries and expenses", \$10,000;

18 RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

19 "Limitation on salaries and expenses" (Increase of
20 \$990,000 in the limitation on "Salaries and expenses") ;

21 RENEGOTIATION BOARD

22 "Salaries and expenses", \$110,000;

23 SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

24 "Salaries and expenses", \$1,000,000;

1 SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

2 “Salaries and expenses”, \$3,971,000, of which \$3,163,-
3 000 shall be derived by transfer from the “Business loan and
4 investment fund”, from the “Disaster loan fund”, and from
5 the “Lease guarantees revolving fund”;

6 SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

7 “Salaries and expenses”, \$1,331,000;

8 “Salaries and expenses, National Gallery of Art,”
9 \$191,000;

10 SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL BOARD

11 Salaries and expenses”, \$57,000;

12 TARIFF COMMISSION

13 “Salaries and expenses”, \$239,000;

14 TAX COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

15 “Salaries and expenses”, \$140,000;

16 UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY

17 “Salaries and expenses”, \$6,883,000;

18 “Special international exhibitions”, \$183,000 to remain
19 available until expended;

20 DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

21 (OUT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FUNDS)

22 “General operating expenses”, \$1,932,000:

23 “Public safety”, \$1,780,000;

24 “Education”, \$966,000;

1 “Parks and recreation”, \$652,000;

2 “Health and welfare”, \$4,478,000;

3 “Highways and traffic”, \$600,000;

4 “Sanitary engineering”, \$1,096,000.

5 DIVISION OF EXPENSES

6 The sums appropriated in this title for the District of
7 Columbia shall be paid as follows: \$10,332,000 from the gen-
8 eral fund; \$533,000 from the highway fund (regular) ; \$14,-
9 000 from the highway fund (parking) ; \$375,000 from the
10 water fund; and \$250,000 from the sanitary sewage works
11 fund.

12 TITLE III

13 INCREASED PAY COSTS—FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

14 SALARY ACT OF 1970

15 SEC. 301. For costs in the fiscal year 1970 of pay in-
16 creases granted by or pursuant to the Federal Employees
17 Salary Act of 1970 and the Act of December 16, 1967 (81
18 Stat. 649), for any branch of the Federal Government or
19 the municipal government of the District of Columbia, to be
20 available immediately, such amounts as may be necessary,
21 to be determined as hereinafter provided in this title, but
22 no appropriation, fund, limitation, or authorization may be
23 increased pursuant to the provisions of this title in an amount
24 in excess of the cost to such appropriation, fund, limitation,

1 or authorization of increased compensation pursuant to such
2 statutes.

3 SEC. 302. Any officer having administrative control of
4 an appropriation, fund, limitation, or authorization properly
5 chargeable with the costs in the fiscal year 1970 of pay
6 increases granted by or pursuant to the Federal Employees
7 Salary Act of 1970 and the Act of December 16, 1967 (81
8 Stat. 649), is authorized to transfer thereto, from the un-
9 obligated balance of any other appropriation, fund, or au-
10 thorization under his administrative control and expiring for
11 obligation on June 30, 1970, such amounts as may be neces-
12 sary for meeting such costs.

13 SEC. 303. Whenever any officer referred to in section 304
14 of this title shall determine that he has exhausted the possi-
15 bilities of meeting the cost of pay increases through the use
16 of transfers as authorized by said section, he shall certify the
17 additional amount required to meet such costs for each ap-
18 propriation, fund, limitation, or authorization under his ad-
19 ministrative control, and the amounts so certified shall be
20 added to the pertinent appropriation, fund, limitation, or
21 authorization for the fiscal year 1970: *Provided*, That any
22 transfer under the authority of section 302 or any certification
23 made under the authority of this section by an officer in or
24 under the executive branch of the Federal Government shall
25 be valid only when approved by the Director of the Bureau
26 of the Budget.

SEC. 304. For the purposes of the transfers and certifications authorized by sections 302 and 303 of this title, the following officers shall be deemed to have administrative control of appropriations, funds, limitations, or authorizations available within their respective organization units—

(a) For the legislative branch:

The Clerk of the House;

The Secretary of the Senate;

The Librarian of Congress;

The Architect of the Capitol;

The Public Printer;

The Comptroller General of the United States;

The Chief Judge of the United States Tax Court;

The chairman of any commission in or under the legislative branch.

(b) For the Judiciary:

The Administrative Officer of the United States Courts.

(c) For the executive branch:

The head of each department, agency, or corporation in or under the executive branch.

(d) For the municipal government of the District of Columbia:

The Commissioner of the District of Columbia.

SEC. 305. Obligations or expenditures incurred for costs

1 in the fiscal year 1970 of pay increases granted by or pur-
2 suant to the Federal Employees Salary Act of 1970 and the
3 Act of December 16, 1967 (81 Stat. 649), shall not be
4 regarded or reported as violations of section 3679 of the
5 Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665).

6 SEC. 306. (a) Amounts made available by this title
7 shall be derived from the same source as the appropriation,
8 fund, limitation, or authorization to which such amounts
9 are added.

10 (b) Appropriations made by, and transfers made pur-
11 suant to, this title shall be recorded on the books of the
12 Government as of June 30, 1970: *Provided*, That no ap-
13 propriation made by this title shall be warranted, and no
14 transfer authorized by this title shall be made, after Au-
15 gust 15, 1970.

16 (c) A complete report of the appropriations and trans-
17 fers made by or pursuant to this title shall be made, not later
18 than September 15, 1970, by the officers described in section
19 304, to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, who shall
20 compile and transmit to the Congress a consolidated report
21 not later than October 15, 1970.

TITLE IV

LIMITATION ON FISCAL YEAR 1970 BUDGET

OUTLAYS

SEC. 401. (a) Notwithstanding the provisions of title IV of the Second Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1969, expenditures and net lending (budget outlays) of the Federal Government during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, shall not exceed \$197,885,000,000: *Provided*, That whenever action, or inaction, by the Congress on requests for appropriations and other budgetary proposals varies from the President's recommendations with respect to the fiscal year 1970, as reflected in the Budget for 1971 (H. Doc. 91-240, part 1), the Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall report to the President and to the Congress his estimate of the effect of such action or inaction on budget outlays, and the limitation set forth herein shall be correspondingly adjusted: *Provided further*, That the Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall report to the President and to the Congress his estimate of the effect on budget outlays of other actions by the Congress (whether initiated by the President or the Congress) and the limitation set forth herein shall be corre-

1 spondingly adjusted: *Provided further*, That in the event the
2 President shall estimate and determine that total budget out-
3 lays cannot be held within the overall limitation provided
4 herein, he may, after notification in writing to the Congress
5 stating his reasons therefor, adjust the amount by not more
6 than one-half of 1 percent thereof.

7 (b) (1) In the event the President shall estimate and
8 determine that budget outlays during the fiscal year 1970 for
9 the following items (the expenditures for which arise under
10 appropriations or other authority not requiring annual action
11 by the Congress) appearing on page 49 of the Budget for
12 1971, namely:

13 (i) items designated "Social security, medicare,
14 and other social insurance trust funds";

15 (ii) the item "National service life insurance (trust
16 fund)";

17 (iii) the item "Interest"; and

18 (iv) the item "Farm price supports (Commodity
19 Credit Corporation) "

20 will exceed the estimates included for such items in the
21 Budget for 1971, the President may, after notification in
22 writing to the Congress stating his reasons therefor, adjust
23 accordingly the amount of the overall limitation provided
24 in subsection (a).

25 (2) In the event the President shall estimate and deter-

1 mine that receipts (credited against budget outlays) during
2 the fiscal year 1970 derived from:

3 (i) sales of financial assets of programs administered
4 by the Farmers Home Administration, Export-Import
5 Bank, agencies of the Department of Housing and Urban
6 Development, and the Veterans' Administration; and

7 (ii) leases of lands on the Outer Continental Shelf;
8 will be less than the estimates included for such items in the
9 Budget for 1971, the President may, after notification in
10 writing to the Congress stating his reasons therefor, adjust
11 accordingly the amount of the overall limitation provided
12 in subsection (a).

13 (3) The aggregate amount of the adjustments made
14 pursuant to paragraphs (1) and (2) of this subsection shall
15 not exceed \$1,000,000,000.

16 (c) The Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall
17 make a preliminary report (by July 31, 1970) and a final
18 report (by December 31, 1970) to the President and the
19 Congress on the operation of this section.

20 TITLE V

21 LIMITATION ON FISCAL YEAR 1971 BUDGET

22 OUTLAYS

23 SEC. 501. (a) Expenditures and net lending (budget
24 outlays) of the Federal Government during the fiscal year
25 ending June 30, 1971, shall not exceed \$200,771,000,000:

1 *Provided*, That whenever action, or inaction, by the Con-
2 gress on requests for appropriations and other budgetary pro-
3 posals varies from the President's recommendations reflected
4 in the Budget for 1971 (II. Doc. 91-240, part 1), the Di-
5 rector of the Bureau of the Budget shall report to the Presi-
6 dent and to the Congress his estimate of the effect of such
7 action or inaction on budget outlays, and the limitation set
8 forth herein shall be correspondingly adjusted: *Provided*
9 *further*, That the Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall
10 report to the President and to the Congress his estimate of
11 the effect on budget outlays of other actions by the Congress
12 (whether initiated by the President or the Congress) and
13 the limitation set forth herein shall be correspondingly ad-
14 justed, and reports, so far as practicable, shall indicate
15 whether such other actions were initiated by the President
16 or by the Congress.

17 (b) (1) In the event the President shall estimate and
18 determine that budget outlays during the fiscal year 1971
19 for the following items (the expenditures for which arise
20 under appropriations or other authority not requiring an-
21 nual action by the Congress) appearing on page 49 of the
22 Budget for 1971, namely:

23 (i) items designated "Social security, medicare, and
24 other social insurance trust funds";

25 (ii) the item "National service life insurance
26 (trust fund)";

1 (iii) the item "Interest"; and

2 (iv) the item "Farm price supports (Commodity
3 Credit Corporation)"

4 will exceed the estimates included for such items in the
5 Budget for 1971, the President may, after notification in
6 writing to the Congress stating his reasons therefor, adjust
7 accordingly the amount of the overall limitation provided in
8 subsection (a).

9 (2) In the event the President shall estimate and deter-
10 mine that receipts (credited against budget outlays) during
11 the fiscal year 1971 derived from:

12 (i) sales of financial assets of programs adminis-
13 tered by the Farmers Home Administration, Export-
14 Import Bank, agencies of the Department of Housing
15 and Urban Development, and the Veterans' Adminis-
16 tration; and

17 (ii) leases of lands on the Outer Continental
18 Shelf;

19 will be less than the estimates included for such items in
20 the Budget for 1971, the President may, after notification
21 in writing to the Congress stating his reasons therefor, adjust
22 accordingly the amount of the overall limitation provided
23 in subsection (a).

24 (3) The aggregate amount of the adjustments made

1 pursuant to paragraphs (1) and (2) of this subsection shall
2 not exceed \$3,000,000,000.

3 (c) The Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall re-
4 port periodically to the President and to the Congress on the
5 operation of this section. Such reports shall be made at the
6 end of each calendar month during the second session of the
7 Ninety-first Congress and at the end of each calendar quar-
8 ter thereafter.

9 TITLE VI

10 GENERAL PROVISIONS

11 SEC. 601. No part of any appropriation contained in this
12 Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current
13 fiscal year unless expressly so provided therein.

14 SEC. 602. Except where specifically increased or de-
15 creased elsewhere in this Act, the restrictions contained with-
16 in appropriations, or provisions affecting appropriations or
17 other funds, available during the fiscal year 1970, limiting
18 the amounts which may be expended for personal services,
19 or for purposes involving personal services, or amounts which
20 may be transferred between appropriations or authorizations
21 available for or involving such services, are hereby increased
22 to the extent necessary to meet increased pay costs author-
23 ized by or pursuant to law.

91ST CONGRESS
2^D SESSION

H. R. 17399

[Report No. 91-1033]

A BILL

Making supplemental appropriations for the
fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for
other purposes.

By Mr. MAHON

APRIL 30, 1970

Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on
the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

DIGEST of Congressional Proceedings

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(FOR INFORMATION ONLY;
NOT TO BE QUOTED OR CITED)

For actions of May 7, 1970
91st-2nd; No. 73

CONTENTS

Adjournment.....8,13	Health benefits.....6	Recreation.....5,12
Appropriations.....1	Housing.....4,16	Reorganization.....7
Disaster relief.....19	Hunger.....14	Subsidies.....2,18
Economics.....15	Manpower training.....10	Textile imports.....22
Environment.....11	Meat imports.....21	Timber supply.....16
Farm machinery.....17	Meat inspection.....21	Water resources.....9
Farm payments.....2,18	Personnel.....6,23	Wilderness.....20
Food stamps.....3	Pollution.....11	

HIGHLIGHTS: House passed supplemental appropriations bill. Rep. Hall objected to striking teamsters receiving food stamps.

HOUSE

1. **APPROPRIATIONS.** Passed with amendments H. R. 17399, making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970. pp. H3999-H4031 (For items of interest to this Department see Digest No. 68).

The Appropriations Committee reported H. R. 17548, making appropriations for sundry independent agencies (H. Report No. 91-1060). p. H4092

2. **FARM PAYMENTS.** Rep. Henderson inserted his statement in which he announced that he has asked Reader's Digest for space to respond to an article, "Time to Say No to Big Farm Subsidies." He said that his article would point out the "distortions and inaccuracies" of their article. pp. H4036-7

3. FOOD STAMPS. Rep. Hall said that it had been substantiated that striking members of the Teamsters Union in St. Louis are receiving federal food stamps and called upon Congress "to amend and remedy the food stamp law to end this inequitable practice." pp. H4038-9
4. HOUSING. The Banking and Currency subcommittee approved for full committee action H. R. 17495, amended, to increase the availability of mortgage credit for the financing of urgently needed housing. p. D456
5. RECREATION. The Interior and Insular Affairs subcommittee approved for full committee action H. R. 14114, amended, to improve the administration of the national park system by the Secretary of the Interior, and to clarify the authorities applicable to the system. p. D457
6. PERSONNEL. The Civil Service Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) H. R. 16968 amended, to provide for the adjustment of the Government contribution with respect to the health benefits coverage of Federal employees and annuitants. p. D457
7. REORGANIZATION. The Government Operations Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) H. Res. 960, to disapprove Reorganization Plan No. 2, involving changes in the Bureau of the Budget and the creation of a Cabinet-level domestic council. p. D457
Rep. Holifield discussed the major features of the plan and recommended the adoption of the resolution and the rejection of the plan. pp. H4078-82
8. ADJOURNED until Mon., May 11. p. H4091

SENATE

9. WATER RESOURCES. Both Houses received reports of river basin commissions established under the Water Resources Planning Act of 1965 (H. Doc. 91-334). pp. S6830, H3999
10. MANPOWER TRAINING. Sen. Javits stated he intends to submit an amendment to the proposed new Manpower Training Act "to provide a limited number of opportunities in the public sector and to 'trigger' additional funds for such public-employer opportunities, as well as training." pp. S6839-40
11. POLLUTION; ENVIRONMENT. Sen. Proxmire suggested modifying S. 3665, to impose a 1¢ per pound national disposal fee on all goods--except consumables--which are going to require disposal within 10 years of origin. pp. S6841-3
Sen. Yarborough inserted a statement by the National Council of Women emphasizing the role of the public in achieving clean air. pp. S6847-50
12. NATIONAL PARK. Sen. Yarborough inserted a Women's Club of Rio Grande City resolution calling for the establishment of Big Thicket National Park. pp. S6858-9
13. ADJOURNED until Mon., May 11. p. S6873

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

14. HUNGER. Rep. Donohue inserted articles supporting programs to feed the hungry. p. E3991

**PERMISSION FOR THE COMMITTEE
ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
TO FILE CERTAIN REPORTS UN-
TIL MIDNIGHT FRIDAY**

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the District of Columbia may have until midnight Friday, May 8, to file certain reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

**REPORTS OF COMMISSIONS, UNDER
WATER RESOURCES PLANNING
ACT OF 1965—MESSAGE FROM
THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED
STATES (H. DOC. NO. 91-334)**

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and ordered to be printed with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States:

In the last few years we have become more aware than ever that the quality of American life depends largely upon how we use—and conserve—our natural resources. It was this growing awareness that prompted the enactment of the Water Resources Planning Act of 1965.

That act provides for the establishment of river basin commissions—if requested by the States in the appropriate area—to plan for the best use and development of rivers, their adjoining land, and their resources. The river basin commissions assure that the people within each area will have a voice in deciding how these resources are used. This approach to planning promises more efficient use of America's great natural and manmade wealth, and more attention to preserving the beauty and vitality of our environment.

Today I transmit the annual reports of the four commissions that have been established under the act. They are the Pacific Northwest River Basins Commission, the Souris-Red-Rainy River Basins Commission, the Great Lakes Basin Commission, and the New England River Basins Commission—covering areas in 21 States.

These annual reports reflect the accomplishments of each commission during fiscal year 1969. They describe existing and emerging problems in the use of our river basins, and help in evaluating opportunities for their sound development.

RICHARD NIXON.

The WHITE HOUSE, May 7, 1970.

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1970

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 972 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 972

Resolved, That during the consideration of the bill (H.R. 17399) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes, all points of order against titles III, IV, and V of said bills are hereby waived.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. SMITH) 30 minutes, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very simple resolution. It merely provides that during the consideration of the bill, H.R. 17399, a bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, all points of order shall be waived against titles III, IV, and V of the bill.

Points of order are waived against title III because of the transfer of funds authorized therein.

Points of order against titles IV and V are waived because they contain limitations on budget outlays, which would amount to legislation in an appropriation measure.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 972 in order that the bill, H.R. 17399, may be considered.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I note that this is described as an open rule. It certainly was not the intention of the Committee on Rules that a rule be granted on this bill that would restrict appropriate amendments being offered to titles IV or V?

Mr. MATSUNAGA. The waiver of points of order is merely to provide that titles III, IV, or V, which contain legislative matter beyond the scope of an appropriation measure, may not be stricken on a point of order.

Mr. YATES. So that with respect to titles IV and V which propose to control expenditures, amendments that are germane may be offered under this rule?

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Yes, I would think so.

Mr. YATES. I thank the gentleman. In other words, it is not the intention of the Committee on Rules to make this a closed rule?

Mr. MATSUNAGA. No, there is no intention to make this a closed rule. It is merely to authorize consideration of titles III, IV, and V, without subjecting such consideration to a point of order.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may use.

(Mr. SMITH of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, may I say to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES) that there is no intention of the Committee on Rules to waive any amendment that is germane to title III, IV, or V. We are only waiving a motion to strike them out be-

cause in title III there is a transfer of Federal funds in sections 302, 303, and 304. Titles IV and V are not germane because of the ceilings set on spending.

My opinion is, and I will not be in the chair, but my opinion is I would certainly think that if amendments are germane to the titles, we are not waiving points of order.

Mr. YATES. I thank the gentleman for his statement. There is a question as to whether or not certain amendments which are going to be offered are proper, and there is a question of interpretation of what the Committee on Rules has done, as to whether it intended a closed rule. I am glad to have the gentleman's statement that it is an open rule and that appropriate amendments will be in order.

Mr. SMITH of California. If the amendments are germane, they would be.

I would simply like to comment that this is the position we find ourselves in when we authorize and appropriate spending over the ceiling which we set. We are misleading our constituents and ourselves to some extent. I remember last year we placed a ceiling in the House of \$192.9 billion on the amount the administration could spend. That did not control the Congress. But we should cooperate to the best of our ability.

The other body reduced the amount to \$191.9 billion. Then Congress passed the 6-percent salary raise. We have lost some revenue in connection with the Outer Shelf oil leases. We have had other expenditures, including the farm subsidy.

Since February 2 of this year I would like you to know that the interest has increased by \$400 million between February 2 and June 30, 1970. That is about \$80 million a month. So now as we act, this ceiling will go up to about \$197.9 billion. Actually, the amount will probably be \$199.1 billion for the fiscal year 1970, which ends on June 30. It would set the ceiling for the next year at \$203.8 billion, and permits certain cushions which could raise the maximum to \$208 billion. I mention that because once again it will depend on how much Congress increases spending over the budget. We may have to have another supplemental bill. There is nothing else to do except pay the expenses of programs that have been authorized and appropriated by Congress. Soon a request will probably be made to increase the debt ceiling.

Mr. DENNEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of California. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. DENNEY. I am concerned about this rule, as far as the bill is concerned; I am concerned about a Hill-Burton hospital that is three-quarters completed. I want to get money into the supplemental to complete that hospital. Is there anything in the rule that would prohibit that?

Mr. SMITH of California. As far as this gentleman is concerned, there is nothing that would prohibit anything in

amounts that are germane to titles III, IV, and V.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the rule.

I do have a request for time. I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. FOREMAN).

AMERICAN YOUTH

(By unanimous consent Mr. FOREMAN was allowed to speak out of order and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Speaker, during the past 16 months, I have spoken before, and visited with, students at 33 grade schools, high schools, colleges, universities, and related activities throughout the State of New Mexico. Never before have I been as optimistic and enthusiastic about the future leadership of our great country than I am now as I see, visit, and listen to the intelligent, alert, and capable young people who make up the great majority of our younger generation today. The young people of today know and understand as much, or more, about our history, Constitution, laws, heritage, principles and country as any young group of any other generation. I find that the overwhelming majority of our students are well-mannered, respectful, honest, decent, responsible, studious, patriotic young Americans who really do love our flag, our Constitution, and country, and who sincerely want to work to help improve on it and build an even stronger, better America. I am encouraged and thankful when I read the hometown newspapers of New Mexico about the work, projects and constructive activities of the Girl Scouts, Boy Scouts, Future Teachers of America, student council groups, Future Farmers of America, fraternities, sororities, various college and university clubs and organizations. I am grateful and appreciative of the concern and positive attitude of the SOS youngsters who are working to help others understand the tragic dangers of drug abuse and the pitfalls and heartaches of narcotics experimentation. We all have reason to be proud of those thousands of young men and women so honorably serving our country here, and in far-off lands, that freedom may be preserved and that America may continue to offer the same blessings of liberty and opportunity to our posterity as it gave to our immigrant forefathers. As a citizen, parent, and Congressman, I am thankful and proud of the character and moral fiber of the fine young Americans of today.

On the other hand, however, I can not help but be saddened and disheartened at the disservice that is being done to the reputation of the overwhelming majority of these fine young people today by the nationwide publicity given to a very small minority of impolite, disrespectful, rabble-rousing, rioting anarchists who knowingly, or perhaps blindly and unknowingly, are marching, demonstrating, burning and bombing, and who are attempting to destroy the very precepts and principles upon which this country was founded. All America has reason to be sickened when they witness this dissident minority as they tear down, spit on and trample the American flag, and at the same demonstration, ridicule and

condemn our President, our Government, and our churches, and then raise and praise the red flag of communism. However, perhaps we may take some consolation in the fact that, according to responsible research on the situation, almost 100 percent of the disruption and destruction is being committed by less than 5 percent of the young people—even though the national news media continues to picture, promote, and publicize them almost 100 percent of the time.

Yes, Americans have reason to be concerned—but they also have reason to be thankful and grateful—not only for our outstanding young people, but for a great, free Democratic Republic that preserves liberty, freedom, and opportunity—even for those who do not earn or respect it.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND).

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I take this time, Mr. Speaker, merely to announce to the House that when we reach the proper point in the bill I will offer an amendment on page 53, line 25, after the amount "\$200,771,000,000," carried as a limitation on expenditures for fiscal year 1971. My amendment will indicate that of these expenditures "none shall be available for use for American ground combat forces in Cambodia."

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Having no further requests for time, Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 17399) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate may be limited to 2 hours, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Bow) and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 105]

Adams	Carter	Erlenborn
Andrews, Ala.	Clark	Feighan
Ashley	Clay	Flowers
Baring	Coughlin	Foley
Bell, Calif.	Cramer	Ford, Gerald R.
Berry	Dawson	Ford,
Blatnik	de la Garza	William D.
Brown, Calif.	Dickinson	Fraser
Buchanan	Dulski	Gilbert

Goldwater	McCarthy	Powell
Gray	McClary	Price, Tex.
Hagan	McClure	Pryor, Ark.
Hébert	McFall	Rosenthal
Hollifield	McMillan	Roudebush
Jarman	Madden	Scheuer
Johnson, Calif.	Melcher	Schneebeli
Kazen	Meskill	Sikes
Kee	Mills	Sisk
Keith	Mollohan	Steiger, Wis.
Kirwan	Moorhead	Taft
Koch	Murphy, Ill.	Teague, Calif.
Langen	Ottinger	Tunney
Leggett	Pike	Wiggins
Lloyd	Poage	Wold
Lujan	Pollock	Yatron

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 355 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1970

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 17399, with Mr. O'HARA in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON) will be recognized for 1 hour and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Bow) will be recognized for 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

SERIOUS FISCAL SITUATION

Mr. MAHON. As I sat here awaiting the opportunity to present this bill, I was aware of the discussions which we have had on the floor today in regard to disorder and the disarray on campuses and in the streets of the country.

This bill, on page 6, contains an appropriation of \$75 million for disaster relief from tornadoes and storms and floods. In addition to these disturbing elements in the present picture, we are also confronted in the fiscal area with elements of disorder and disarray and possible disaster.

Since the fiscal 1970 budget was submitted in April of 1969, estimated budget spending has escalated by at least \$6 billion. It seems evident that we will be lucky if Federal budget spending during the current fiscal year is held below \$200 billion. We are knocking at the door of a \$200 billion expenditure for the current fiscal year.

There is no hope that for the forthcoming fiscal year budget spending will be held below \$200 billion.

As Members know, we are currently borrowing about \$8 billion a year from the Social Security, Highway, and other trust funds. We are borrowing those funds, paying interest on them, and utilizing them for the regular operations of the Government. Members know that those funds will eventually have to be replaced and except for the fact that we are borrowing those trust funds, the Fed-

eral funds portion of the pending budget would be in the red in the sum of at least \$8 billion.

SUMMARY OF THE BILL

Mr. Chairman, this bill provides appropriations in the sum of \$5,760,115,791. Nearly 90 percent of the money in this bill is, at this stage, more or less uncontrollable insofar as the appropriations process is concerned.

The great bulk of the funds in this bill are for pay raises in the military and civilian areas of government. Members will recall that only a few weeks ago we passed a pay increase bill making pay increases of 6 percent retroactive to about last December 27. There is in this bill the sum of about \$1.3 billion, for the current fiscal year 1970, to take care of the 6 percent pay increase which was enacted a short time ago.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, did the gentleman say there is funding in this bill for the recently approved pay increase bill that was retroactive to December 27, or does this cover only the pay increases of last year?

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman raises a question about the pay increases that were set in operation as the result of existing law, last July.

Mr. GROSS. Yes.

Mr. MAHON. In this bill there is \$3 billion to take care of those pay increases. In other words, the pay increase money in this bill is considerably above \$4 billion—about \$4.4 billion.

Mr. GROSS. Does this or does it not take care of the pay increase which was recently voted, of 6 percent?

Mr. MAHON. It takes care of that in the sum of about \$1.3 billion.

I would point out, of course it does not take care of the cost of the 6 percent pay increase for the forthcoming fiscal year 1971 which will begin on July 1.

In addition to the funds necessary for pay increases, there are funds provided for the following purposes: compensation payments and education and training for veterans, public assistance grants, payments to retired military personnel, unemployment compensation for the Federal employees and ex-servicemen, and annual contributions for low-rent public housing. This covers about \$800 million more, which is included in the bill. The sum for disaster relief, heretofore referred to, is \$75 million.

Mr. Chairman, under leave granted, I include excerpts from the committee report containing a summary of the major appropriation features of the bill.

SUMMARY OF BILL

The bill funds various general program supplementals; pay increase costs due to comparability adjustments of last July; pay increase costs resulting from the recently enacted Federal Employees Salary Act of 1970 (the 6% retroactive pay bill); includes a revised ceiling on budget outlays for fiscal 1970; includes a proposed budget outlay ceiling for fiscal 1971; and includes a title involving the usual general provisions.

The estimates on which it is based are included in House Documents 91-272; 273; 288; 293; 306; 311; 315; and 322.

A brief discussion of the over-all bill totals follows. Details concerning the committee recommendations are covered in the various chapters and titles of this report, which are arranged in the order of the bill itself.

GRAND TOTAL OF BILL

The grand total of new budget (obligational) authority recommended in the bill is \$5,760,115,791, a reduction of \$157,957,340 from the \$5,918,073,131 requested.

In addition, title I includes proposed increases of \$75,000,000 in limitations on annual contract authorizations involving interest subsidies for homeownership and rental housing assistance and college housing.

The committee has also recommended transfers between appropriations amounting to \$49,384,900 and increases in limitations on administrative and nonadministrative expenses of trust funds amounting to \$45,334,700. Authorization to transfer between appropriation accounts has the effect of reducing the need for new budget (obligational) authority.

Excluding the \$1,350,000,000 for the recently enacted 6% retroactive pay increase, the total supplemental estimates considered by the Committee amount to less than the comparable aggregate figure encompassed in the overall total in the President's February budget for 1970 supplemental items, and the committee recommendation is still less than the amounts requested.

Nearly 90% of the new budget obligational authority total in the bill is for items that are virtually uncontrollable at this point. It

includes \$1,350,000,000 for the Federal Employees Salary Act of 1970, which was generally effective as of December 27, 1969, and \$2,909,729,830 under title II for costs of comparability pay increases pursuant to the most part to PL 90-206 and PL 90-207 which were generally effective as of the beginning of the fiscal year last July 1st.

Just under \$800,000,000 is also included for mandatory payments under the following programs:

Compensation payments and education and training for veterans,

Public assistance grants,

Payments to retired military personnel,

Unemployment compensation for Federal employees and ex-servicemen, and

Annual contributions for low-rent public housing.

In addition, \$75,000,000 is included for disaster relief assistance requirements, and \$6,591,406 for claims and judgments.

APPROXIMATE REDUCTION EFFECT ON 1970

BUDGETED OUTLAYS

The committee estimates that the reduction of \$157,957,340 in new budget (obligational) authority and its actions on requested transfers will have the effect of reducing budgeted outlays for 1970 by approximately \$123,300,000 from the amounts projected in the President's February budget.

TITLE II AND III—INCREASED PAY COSTS

Following is a summary of new budget (obligational) authority for pay cost increases in the bill:

	Budget authority estimates	Bill	Difference
Title I.....	\$96,781,000	\$96,781,000	-----
Title II.....	3,023,804,670	2,909,729,830	-114,074,840
Title III (indefinite).....	1,350,000,000	1,350,000,000	-----
Total.....	4,470,585,670	4,356,510,830	-114,074,840

TITLE II

Title II of the bill includes the bulk of supplemental funds required to meet the unabsorbed portion of increased pay and related costs for fiscal 1970. Title I of the bill includes the remainder of the funds for this purpose. The regular 1970 appropriations did not allow for these costs, and agencies have been spending on a deficiency basis as the law permits in such cases. (Section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665)).

The greatest share of increased pay costs in this title result from the Federal comparability pay raises made effective July 1, 1969. These increases result from Public laws 90-206 and 90-207, which cover postal and other civilian employees, military personnel, legislative, and judicial employees. Increases for employees of the District of Columbia as well as for wage-board employees in line with prevailing rates are also covered by this title.

The total cost of these pay increases was estimated in the February, 1970 budget to be \$3,737,613,212. To cover the cost the President requested \$3,125,051,786 in new budget (obligational) authority in House Document 91-272 and proposed to absorb the difference from previously appropriated funds. The absorption amounts to \$612,561,426 or about 16% of the total.

The Committee has examined the individual requests, making reductions wherever they seemed reasonably possible. The largest single reduction is \$102,271,000 in the Department of Defense. It should be said that the Executive has also combed these estimates, and that they are for mandatory costs in effect during the entire fiscal year.

The committee also considered under title II a separate pay item for \$250,000 included in H. Doc. 91-306, but as usual deferred action on Senate items amounting to \$4,716,-

116, making the effective request considered \$3,120,585,670. The comparable committee recommendation is \$3,006,510,830, a reduction of \$114,074,840, distributed in the bill as follows: \$96,781,000 recommended under title I, the amount of the request; \$2,909,729,830 recommended under title II, a reduction of \$114,074,840 from the \$3,023,804,670 requested. Transfers between appropriations throughout title II amounting to \$42,181,900 have been approved and also contribute to limiting the amount of new budget (obligational) authority that would otherwise be necessary.

TITLE III

(Federal Employees Salary Act of 1970)

This title of the bill relates to additional funds for increased pay costs arising during the current fiscal year 1970 from enactment of Public Law 91-231, approved April 15, 1970, the Federal Employees Salary Act of 1970—the so-called 6% retroactive pay bill, effective generally back to December 27, 1969. (Title II of the bill, explained above, relates to additional funds for civilian and military personnel pay increases that were generally effective from the beginning of the fiscal year 1970 last July 1st.)

The Committee recommends a single, lump-sum, indefinite appropriation for the purposes of Public Law 91-231. The best estimate available to the Committee of additional cost during the 6 months the law will be in effect in fiscal 1970 is \$1,350,000,000. That may or may not be the final additional total of appropriations actually put on the books under the indefinite provision in the bill. Some portion—now indeterminable—of the costs may eventually be absorbed by transfers between existing appropriations, or otherwise.

Moreover, in terms of aggregate budgetary spending totals for fiscal 1970 reflected in the February budget, the net add-on effect

would be about \$1,175,000,000. This net budgetary add-on results from the offset effect of a lump-sum allowance of \$175,000,000 in the 1970 totals related to a postal pay raise proposal which was superseded by the version enacted as Public Law 91-231.

The appropriation—as does the law itself—covers additional costs of the pay increase in fiscal 1970 for military personnel; for postal employees; and, generally, those other civilian employees except where rates of pay are fixed periodically on a prevailing wage basis (so-called wage-board employees).

It covers all three branches of the Government. It includes the District of Columbia Government.

Except for technical conforming changes, the lump-sum, indefinite appropriation approach corresponds exactly with that used in similar retroactive pay situations in 1958 and 1955. (The President, in H. Doc. 91-322, has also recommended this approach.)

As explained in connection with title II pay cost supplementals, the Executive Branch—operating, as it has been, under an overall expenditure ceiling in fiscal 1970—screened those pay supplemental requests, looking for opportunities to absorb portions of the added costs by way of transfers of funds or otherwise. The Committee has similarly examined the supplemental requests and made reductions wherever it reasonably could. Under the circumstances, it did not seem to offer any productive results to go through yet another detailed, item-by-item calculation, submission, review, and recommendation, covering essentially the same ground this late in the fiscal year.

Thus the recommendation for a single, indefinite appropriation, which procedurally would work this way:

1. *Section 301* makes the appropriation of "such amounts as may be necessary", but carries the safeguard that no appropriation may be increased beyond the costs attributable to the basic law.

2. *Section 302* gives authority to transfer unobligated balances from funds otherwise expiring for obligation on June 30, 1970 (to assist in meeting the increased costs and thus diminishing the added appropriation otherwise required).

3. *Section 303* provides the procedure for certifying the amounts of added appropriations required, but as to both this and any transfers under section 302 relating to the Executive Branch, requires the approval of the Director of the Budget.

4. *Sections 304-306* are also facilitating, are self-explanatory, and, among other things, require the Budget Director to submit a complete report to Congress not later than October 15, 1970 on the actual transfers made and the actual appropriations put on the books under the provisions of this title.

EXPENDITURE CEILING REVISION, FISCAL YEAR 1970

As Members will remember, last year, for fiscal year 1970, we enacted an overall expenditure ceiling of \$191.9 billion for the Government. It was a flexible ceiling, adjustable on the basis of congressional actions or inactions on budget and spending authority. We provided, also, that in addition to this ceiling the executive would have a cushion of \$2 billion because of the likelihood of the cost of so-called designated uncontrollables rising above the estimates, such as interest on the public debt, social security, and so on.

The situation has worsened to a greater extent than had been anticipated in the Congress or in the executive branch, so now we are having to revise the expenditure limitation for the current fiscal year, which ends on June 30 of this

year. We are in this bill revising the ceiling upward to \$197.9 billion, as a beginning figure—that is, without any of the adjustments which may be made, up or down, as a result of congressional actions or inactions and overruns on so-called uncontrollables. In other words, we have updated the expenditure ceiling. We also allow some cushion for unavoidable overruns. Current year expenditures, as I said, are probably going very near \$200 billion.

Some may say that this is more or less an exercise in futility. Of course, it is not productive of vast savings, but it does keep constantly before the Congress, the country and the executive the enormous and growing cost of the Federal Government. In my judgment, this ceiling procedure is worth continuing. We propose to continue the practice in 1971.

Mr. Chairman, I include excerpts from the committee report explaining the proposed revision of the 1970 outlay ceiling.

TITLE IV—LIMITATION (REVISED) ON FISCAL YEAR 1970 BUDGET OUTLAYS

Title IV of the bill would update and reset the overall ceiling on government spending for the current fiscal year 1970.

The basic need for resetting the ceiling stems from underestimates of requirements in the original budget revision (of April 15, 1969) with respect to a handful of so-called designated uncontrollable items for which the ceiling law allowed a \$2 billion "cushion". In all instances, these involve objects and programs for which the budget outlays arise out of appropriations or other authority, or relate to receipts that operate to offset budget outlays, that do not require annual action by the Congress—in other words, permanent appropriations or other spending authority contained in basic law, or actions or inactions that operate otherwise to determine budget outlays under the unified budget concept.

Other than for the overrun from miscalculations of requirements for the designated uncontrollables, spending in fiscal 1970 has been kept within the statutory ceiling. As of the date of the revised figures in the new budget (Feb. 2), the overrun for these designated uncontrollables was \$4.3 billion in relation to the April, 1969 estimates (in other words, \$2.3 billion above the \$2 billion "cushion" provided for them in the original ceiling law), as follows:

Outlay overruns to April 1969 estimates for designated uncontrollables

[In billions of dollars]	
Social insurance trust funds.....	+1.7
Interest.....	+1.4
Sales of financial assets (offsets to outlays).....	+0.9
Leases of lands, Outer Continental Shelf (offsets to outlays).....	+0.3
National service life insurance fund.....	(¹)
Farm price supports.....	(¹)
Total.....	+4.3

¹ Less than \$50 million.

Note.—The \$1.7 billion increase for social insurance trust funds is in addition to the \$1.7 billion increase in social security benefits voted by the Congress in the last session, which has also been reflected in the revised spending ceiling.

The Budget Director told the Committee that further changes in some of these items are already apparent. Interest on the debt for 1970, for example, is now estimated to go \$400 million above the February estimate. Others have increased, offset by some

decreases. The current net change outlook in this limited area of items is \$300 million above the February estimate for 1970.

Other changes of course affect the current expenditure outlook for fiscal 1970 and enter into an accounting for the variation from the original overall \$192.9 billion administration spending estimate and the original overall \$191.9 billion spending ceiling. Congress made an initial cut of \$1 billion from the estimate in setting the ceiling; the administration itself submitted supplements and amendments to its original budget; Congress acted on the portions of the budget subject to annual action, making changes in both directions; Congress failed to act on several other budgetary proposals, likewise affecting the figures; normal reestimating of 1970 outlays in connection with formulating the 1971 budget also introduced some differences; and anticipated second session actions are in the picture.

The revised fiscal 1970 spending estimate in the 1971 budget (of February 2) is \$197.9 billion—\$5 billion above the original administration \$192.9 billion spending estimate and \$6 billion above the original \$191.9 billion congressional ceiling amount. Here is a capsule accounting for the differences to February 2, the date of the new budget—based on Executive Branch figures and thus ignoring classification and estimating differences of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Federal Expenditures:

	[Billions]	
	Original estimate	Original ceiling
Original estimate and original ceiling.....	\$192.9	\$191.9
Changes—		
1. Original blanket cut by Congress.....	-1.0	
2. Administration underestimates on designated uncontrollables (on which annual action is not required).....	+4.3	+4.3
3. Actions and inactions on original April 1969 estimates (includes about \$1,200,000,000 for administration additions):		
Appropriation acts.....	-1.9	-1.9
Other acts (social security, etc.).....	+1.5	+1.5
Inactions (postal rates, sales of financial assets, etc.).....	+1.3	+1.3
Subtotal, actions and inactions.....	+0.9	+0.9
4. Anticipated 2d session actions affecting fiscal 1970 (pay raises, veterans, public assistance, etc.).....	+0.9	+0.9
5. Nominal margin in revised estimate for other spending.....	-0.1	-0.1
Net change, all factors.....	+5.0	+6.0
6. Revised 1970 spending estimate (in 1971 budget).....	197.9	197.9

THE REVISED CEILING PROPOSED IN THE BILL

For purposes of more complete disclosure and for simplicity as well as for technical reasons, the Committee has restated the full ceiling language in the bill rather than attempt to variously amend the existing ceiling law. The Executive Branch communication of March 12 had recommended essentially the latter procedure, embodying two substantive changes:

1. Removing altogether the ceiling on the "cushion" for designated uncontrollables—in view of the lack of effective controllability and the difficulties of estimating precisely.

2. Providing a \$1 billion "cushion" within the basic ceiling to provide a margin sufficient to permit prudent management in the few remaining weeks of the current fiscal

year if the mark is missed on expenditure estimates for essential programs. (The proposition was to raise the existing "base" ceiling of \$191.9 billion to \$192.9 billion.)

The Committee prefers to supersede the old ceiling with a new provision, setting the "base" or beginning ceiling at \$197,885,000,000 (i.e., \$197.9 billion), the revised fiscal 1970 estimate of budget outlays shown in the 1971 budget of February 2. Coupled with this would be language, like in the existing ceiling law, that would operate continuously to adjust the ceiling, as appropriate, to comport with estimated expenditure effect of specific congressional actions or inactions having an impact on the February "base" or beginning ceiling of \$197,885,000,000. Certain completed actions and inactions already occurring in the present session would constitute a basis for adjusting this base figure. They are noted on page 760 of the printed hearings, and include the \$1.2 billion relating to the 6% retroactive pay bill.

The Budget Director, on April 13, told the Committee that the administration may be able to hold total 1970 budget outlays to \$199.1 billion but could not be certain that would result. Because of the inherent uncertainties in estimating the exact timing of budget outlays and with the possibility that a miscalculation could cause undue disruption to prudent management in the closing weeks of the fiscal year, the Committee has included a $\frac{1}{2}$ of 1 percent "cushion" providing—

"That in the event the President shall estimate and determine that total budget outlays cannot be held within the overall limitation provided herein, he may, after notification in writing to the Congress stating his reasons therefor, adjust the amount by not more than $\frac{1}{2}$ of 1 percent thereof."

The administration has pledged that it will continue its vigorous efforts to control Federal spending. Thus the primary burden will be on the President to avoid use of this latitude altogether if reasonably possible, and in any event to call upon it sparingly unless absolutely essential to do otherwise.

Rather than remove altogether—as the Executive proposes—the ceiling on the "cushion" for designated uncontrollables (i.e., a handful of items on which Congress does not annually act), the Committee has inserted a \$1,000,000,000 "cushion" for any further overruns in such items. As noted above, the Budget Director very recently advised the Committee that there is already an apparent net overrun (beyond the February 2 estimates) of about \$300,000,000, but if the administration is able to hold aggregate 1970 outlays to \$199.1 billion as they have indicated, that \$300 million would be offset by decreases elsewhere and thus not mortgage any of the \$1 billion "cushion". Based on present information, the \$1 billion "cushion" seems quite adequate as a standby authority for these designated uncontrollables.

PROPOSED OVERALL EXPENDITURE CEILING, FISCAL YEAR 1971

We have set in this bill another expenditure limitation for the fiscal year 1971 which begins on July 1 of this year. On that the initial expenditure limitation as proposed would be \$200.8 billion, which is the estimated expenditure of the Administration shown in the February 2 budget. In other words, we have accepted the best estimate of the administration. Admittedly, no administration and no Congress is able to estimate precisely what may develop in fiscal affairs.

As our hearings disclose, and as we know, there are already indications that the initial figure for fiscal 1971 may go upward unless greater restraint is exercised.

One of the handicaps which the administration has at the moment is that it is not able to ascertain just what the revenue collections will be as a result of the April 15 income tax date, and so forth.

We provide for an initial expenditure limitation for next year of \$200.8 billion, but we take into account the fact that there may be unexpected expenditures. Congressional actions and inactions will also influence the situation. There are events which may bring about additional expenditures in certain so-called uncontrollables. So we provide a cushion for fiscal year 1971 of \$3 billion, making the real ceiling, unless the Congress changes it—and the Executive cannot change it without the concurrence of Congress—making the initial expenditure ceiling for fiscal year 1971, \$203.8 billion.

This is one of the major proposals in the bill. It is not unduly restrictive. But it will give us a target. We have had to go above the expenditure limitation this year by about \$6 billion. We hope that such will not be the case in the forthcoming fiscal year, but at least we have set the target, which will be the target, we hope, of the Congress and of the administration. If we are able to make reductions below that, that will be all to the good.

Mr. Chairman, I include excerpts from the committee report explaining the proposed 1971 ceiling.

TITLE V. LIMITATION ON FISCAL YEAR 1971 BUDGET OUTLAYS

Title V of the bill would place an overall ceiling on budget outlays of the Federal Government during the fiscal year 1971 that begins on July 1, 1970. The precise terminology is "Expenditures and net lending" which, taken together, constitute "budget outlays".

CONCEPT OF THE CEILING

The proposed ceiling for fiscal 1971 is quite similar in concept and structure to the ceiling currently applicable to the fiscal year 1970. There is, however, one major difference: Congress, in enacting the 1970 ceiling last July, imposed a blanket \$1 billion cut from the budget spending total at the outset. The proposal for 1971 in the accompanying bill makes no such cut. The Committee did not recommend any initial cut last year and does not think it appropriate to do so this year.

The Committee, in initiating an all-encompassing ceiling last year, was not seeking to advance a vehicle for arbitrary broad-axe type cutbacks that would leave to the Executive the allocation of any spending reduction to specific agencies and programs. The whole idea was to focus on the totality of Federal spending by putting the control of total spending in the hands of Congress, adjustable only by the Congress.

It is not too widely recognized that in the various annual bills affecting the budget, Congress, in respect to the \$200.8 billion fiscal 1971 spending budget, would normally deal with requests involving less than half of that spending total—about 47 percent, to be more exact. (The other 53 percent springs from unexpended carryover balances from previous years and from so-called permanent appropriations that arise automatically under earlier laws.)

By covering the annual expenditures from all sources, the ceiling focuses on the total and tends to keep it in focus. And such a ceiling affords the opportunity to force attention on possible alternatives and substitutes when upward pressures are exerted on the ceiling.

An overall ceiling, adjustable to the independent decisions of the Congress in the various bills during the year, not only provides a useful disciplinary target to guide individual actions by Congress and the Executive, but can also have some usefulness as a short-run regulating device, especially when economic and fiscal pressures are great.

THE CEILING FOR 1971

The amount specifically stated in the provision in the bill, \$200,771,000,000, is a beginning figure, not an ending figure. It is the President's initial projection of 1971 budget outlays in the Budget for 1971, submitted February 2.

Coupled with the \$200.8 billion, figure is language, identical to what is in the current ceiling, providing—

"* * * That whenever action, or inaction, by the Congress on requests for appropriations and other budgetary proposals varies from the President's recommendations reflected in the Budget for 1971 (H. Doc. 91-240, part 1), the Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall report to the President and to the Congress his estimate of the effect of such action or inaction on budget outlays, and the limitation set forth herein shall be correspondingly adjusted: *Provided further*, That the Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall report to the President and to the Congress his estimate of the effect on budget outlays of other actions by the Congress (whether initiated by the President or the Congress) and the limitation set forth herein shall be correspondingly adjusted * * *"

In other words, Congress would work from the President's proposed total spending estimate. It would do so through its actions, or its inactions, on requests for appropriations and other budget obligatory authority and outlay proposals in the various appropriation bills and other bills affecting budget proposals, including amendments and supplements to the February budget.

The language would operate continuously to adjust the ceiling, as appropriate, to comfort with the estimated expenditure effect of specific congressional actions or inactions having budgetary impact.

It is a flexible provision—but in terms of aggregate spending, flexible only on the action of the Congress, not the Executive.

It does not seek to declare something of the end from the beginning; it sets a beginning point against which Congress would work in deciding, through its various spending actions, what the ultimate total should be, and supplies a mechanism for resetting the ceiling accordingly.

It would be the second ceiling ever to place directly in the hands of Congress the specific decision as to the maximum amounts to be taken out of the Treasury for payment of the Government's bills in a given 12-month period.

The ceiling proposed in this bill would afford opportunity for maximum flexibility within the overall total to meet, as fully as reasonably possible, changed and changing expenditure requirements in certain specific programs that cannot be foreseen with great precision. The administration is committed to continue vigorous efforts to control Federal spending. An aggregate ceiling should be facilitating in this regard.

Of course, the President can seek supplemental relief to meet necessary but unforeseen and unavoidable outlay increases which he finds cannot be accommodated within the overall total.

Setting a beginning ceiling in this fashion should in no way discourage the Executive Branch from its continuing commitment—and responsibility—for seeking to conduct the day-to-day management of government programs at the very minimum cost consistent with the public necessities, refraining from spending every dollar that can reasonably be saved. Constructive economy in pub-

lie spending is not alone a matter of legislative decision. It is also a matter of administration. The administration has attached high priority to quality of performance in administering the government. Wasteful and needless expenditures often do not become so until funds are poorly managed. The primary burden of getting a dollar's value for every dollar justifiably appropriated to the purposes of government lies mainly with those who administer, not with those who legislate.

CUSHION FOR DESIGNATED UNCONTROLLABLES

Experience in the current fiscal year 1970 clearly suggests the advisability of providing some limited "cushion" for underestimates of budget outlays in fiscal 1971 for certain so-called uncontrollable objects and programs, i.e., in a handful of cases, *where Congress does not annually act on the budgetary estimates involved*. These are mainly so-called permanent authorizations that each year automatically stem from various basic laws.

A "cushion" for such items, of \$2,000,000,000, was carried in the 1970 ceiling law, but already, as explained earlier in this report in connection with title IV of the bill, the overruns arising from administration miscalculations of outlay requirements approximate \$4,300,000,000, and will probably go even higher before fiscal 1970 ends.

Accordingly, the bill proposes a similar cushion for 1971—covering the same items as did the 1970 ceiling law—but puts a dollar limit of \$3,000,000,000 on how far the President can go in so adjusting the ceiling on this account. This is higher than the current year cushion but considerably less than the current year overrun. It amounts to about 1½ percent of the overall budget total and about 4½ percent of the estimates for the items involved.

The items encompassed are listed on page 49 of the Budget for 1971. They generally involve very large sums and items where it is difficult to make accurate projections. The items are:

Social security, medicare, and other social insurance trust funds;

National service life insurance (trust fund);

Interest; and

Farm price supports (Commodity Credit Corporation).

Decline of receipts (credited in the budget against expenditures and net lending) derived from—

Sales of financial assets of programs administered by the Farmers Home Administration, Export-Import Bank, agencies of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and Veterans' Administration, and

Leases of lands on the Outer Continental Shelf.

In contrast to the situation as to these designated uncontrollables on which Congress does not annually act, since the bill sets a comprehensive ceiling which would be continuously adjustable based on congressional actions or inactions on budgetary proposals whether initiated by the President or by the Congress and whether or not inside or outside the February 2 budget totals, there is no necessity to exempt any area of the budget that Congress normally acts upon each year. Approval of supplemental appropriations to meet existing *unbudgeted* requirements would also be the basis for a corresponding adjustment in the ceiling on budget outlays.

UNEXPENDED CARRYOVER BALANCES AND THE DIMENSIONS OF ANNUAL ACTIONS

The proposed ceiling provision, being all-inclusive, covers outlays in fiscal 1971 from

budget authority to be newly granted in this session; outlays from so-called permanent appropriations that flow automatically from earlier laws; and outlays from unexpended carryover balances of prior years. Very substantial portions of the \$200.8 billion beginning ceiling figure spring from each of these three general sources of expenditure availability.

For example, total unexpended carryover balances at the beginning of fiscal 1971 will approximate \$234 billion—about \$108 billion in social security and other trust funds and \$126 billion in Federal funds. But some \$77 billion of the \$126 billion of Federal funds will have been obligated for programs across the government but not yet actually paid out. The remaining \$49 billion, not obligated and not expended, is in many accounts across the government.

But of the \$234 billion total beginning carryover, trust and federal funds combined, roughly \$96 billion is projected for expenditure (disbursement, that is) in fiscal 1971, and roughly that amount is thus counted in the \$200.8 billion ceiling figure. The remainder of the carryovers—some \$138 billion—becomes part of the total unexpended carryover projected into the following year, fiscal 1972.

Roughly then, it can be seen that only about \$105 billion of the newly projected outlay total for 1971 (\$200.8 billion, less the \$96 billion from carryovers) is estimated to come from the \$218 billion *net* new budget authority requested or estimated for that same year of 1971. In other words, the 1971 outlay total involves *less than half* of the new budget authority requested for 1971. Funds appropriated in a given year are expended partly in that year and partly in subsequent years because of long lead-times, construction time, and other factors.

Dimensions of annual actions on budget

Budget obligational authority (appropriations, essentially) is the traditional basis on which appropriation and authorization bills are stated and voted on regardless of the year or years in which the funds are to be actually disbursed in the form of budget outlays.

Thus the \$200.8 billion "outlay" budget for 1971 is *not* the "action" budget before the Congress. The Congress will *not* vote on that figure in the various appropriation and other spending and authorization bills relating to fiscal 1971. Congress, in these bills, will be voting on an entirely different basis—the appropriations or new budget (obligational) authority basis.

The gross total new budget (obligational) authority proposed or estimated in the February budget for 1971—and this is not as widely known as the more familiar \$200.8 billion outlay estimate—is \$234,819,000,000, *gross*.

Of that, about \$86,706,000,000 is estimated to become available automatically without action by the Congress this session for such so-called permanent items as interest on the debt and various social insurance trust funds. That leaves roughly \$148,113,000,000 subject to congressional action this year. That is the total in the February budget for 1971, and, like all budgets, is subject to amendments and supplements from time to time (already, for example, the President's messages of April 3 and 16, relating to pay increases and postage rates and reform, have substantially modified the budget aggregates in some particulars).

The February budget for 1971 in respect to budget authority totals; budget outlay totals and what is subject to annual action and what is not is capsuled in the following table using budget figures:

(In millions)

	New budget authority, 1971 budget requests (est.)	Budget outlays, 1971 (est.)
1. Proposed to be available through current actions by the Congress.....	148,113	92,798
2. Portion estimated to become available without current actions by the Congress (so-called permanent authorizations under laws of earlier years, such as interest on the debt, social security and other trust funds, etc.).....	86,706	28,826
Subtotal.....	234,819	121,624
3. Outlays from unexpended carryover balances of all kinds (from prior years).....		95,935
Gross total.....	234,819	217,559
4. Deduct offsetting receipts (intrabudgetary transactions to avoid double counting, and "proprietary receipts from the public").....	-16,788	-16,788
Net totals in the 1971 budget.....	218,031	200,771

THE \$200.8 BILLION OUTLAY ESTIMATE FOR 1971

There have been a number of developments since submission of the February 2 budget that either constitute a basis for adjusting the \$200.8 billion outlay total upward under the flexible ceiling provision proposed in the bill or point to upward pressures on it. A number of major specifics are mentioned in the printed hearings, at pages 788-790.

Other developments of many kinds, and for many reasons, will of course take place as the session and the year progress, that will bear on both the outgo and income sides of the fiscal 1971 budget. The Committee merely thought it appropriate to call attention to these major specifics mentioned in the hearings since the \$200.8 billion figure is used in the ceiling language of the accompanying bill notwithstanding the fact that things have already happened, some of which lay the basis for changes in that figure; some do not.

ADMINISTRATION OF PUBLIC DEBT

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman again yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

We cannot be very optimistic at this time with respect to Federal revenue, can we?

Mr. MAHON. I do not think so.

Mr. GROSS. With corporations and other businesses reporting declining business conditions.

Mr. MAHON. This is true. We are confronted with a very serious situation, if not the possibility of a disastrous situation. If we are to avoid disaster, it seems to me we have to try to hold the line as well as we possibly can do so.

We reported out of the Committee on Appropriations today, under the subcommittee chairmanship of the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. EVINS), the independent offices and HUD appropriation bill, the biggest ever, amounting to \$17 billion plus. I have been told that perhaps a half a billion

dollar increase above the budget will be offered and campaigned for by way of an increase. If we throw away all fiscal restraints, this country will have had it, and while we may not pay in taxes for what we are spending, we will pay in run-away inflation, which is worse than taxes.

Mr. GROSS. I note with this bill the cost of administration of the Bureau of the Public Debt will be more than \$63 million on an annual basis. I can remember when I first came to the Congress the appropriation for the Bureau of the Public Debt was about \$20 million and perhaps even less. Now \$63 million is being expended simply to administer the office. This does not include a single dollar for the carrying charges of \$20 billion a year on the public debt. It is simply to administer it. This is almost unconscionable.

Mr. MAHON. Well, of course, the administering of the public debt at this time of economic disturbance is very difficult. Many operations are necessary now that were not necessary at an earlier date.

I see the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. STEED), the chairman of the subcommittee that handles that appropriation, is here, and I will yield to him for a comment.

Mr. STEED. In regard to the form of administering the public debt, the largest item in the \$63 million is nearly \$31 million which goes for postage. Then the next largest item is the fees that we pay the Federal Reserve banks and the commercial banks of the country for cashing savings bonds and doing other functions for the Treasury Department.

Mr. GROSS. I note that there is contained in this supplemental appropriation bill an increase of \$250,000 with which to print Treasury certificates. Is this just to purchase oil for the printing presses or is it to buy new printing presses in order to expedite the printing? What is the story?

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Texas would yield further, the bonds, notes and the paper money that they have to purchase in this country I believe last year according to the Treasury they had to issue about 174 million pieces of paper called bonds, notes or bills. This is just an increase in the cost of the material which they have to use. There has been an unprecedented increase, as the gentleman from Iowa understands, in the cashing of savings bonds. This is to pay a 15-percent fee for each bond cashed. This is an uncontrollable item. So, it just reflects the volume of selling and buying which is going on in this field these days.

PAY INCREASE APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield for one further question—

Mr. MAHON. I yield further to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Did the committee in setting up this figure of \$1,350 million to fund the recent pay increases, pull together any figures as to the number and cost of pay increases for, say, the last 10 years?

Mr. MAHON. The various subcommittees screened the various pay requests that were made. We insisted that the departments absorb as much of the pay increase as possible. Large sums will be absorbed. This bill contains certain transfer authority which will help enable the agencies to meet these requirements; otherwise, the bill would be greater than it is.

It is a matter of great concern, of course, to the committee and to the gentleman from Iowa as well as to the people generally as to the great cost which is involved.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Has the chairman been able to make an estimate as to what this supplemental appropriation, plus the regular appropriation, will do in terms of increasing the national debt? What will be the net increase in the national debt?

Mr. MAHON. Well, I assume that we will have a rather spirited debate in the near future on the issue of increasing the public debt. There will be an increase in the public debt. What effect this will have I could not predict at this time.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I have seen various estimates, one as high as a \$15 billion deficit, for fiscal 1970.

Obviously, if we had some indication as to what the figures are, it would certainly affect our action on this legislation.

The gentleman suggests that much of these expenditures are uncontrollable. I do not quite understand that.

Mr. MAHON. Nearly 90 percent of the bill is for legislated pay increases and other mandatory-type payments, as page 2 of the committee report clearly indicates. Congress raised the pay and after we raised the pay, unless we rescind that action, it is more or less uncontrollable, unless there is a vast reduction in personnel otherwise. Certain other items—public assistance, veterans, and so forth—fall somewhat in the same category.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, we, for instance, authorize a certain amount of money for education and then we only fund one-half of it. We have a lot of programs around here where we authorize substantially more than we appropriate. It is not uncommon, as a matter of fact, for the Appropriations Committee to hold the line on almost every single authorization.

As the gentleman said, we did raise the salaries, but has any effort been made to reduce the number of Government employees to pick up some of that slack?

Mr. MAHON. An effort certainly has been made, but after Congress screens the requests, appropriates for the various programs, and the people are on the payroll you have to pay them for their services at the authorized rates. That is essentially what is involved here.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I would ask the gentleman if it is not true and fair to say that when Congress votes a pay increase that is not the same as authorizing a ceiling on a new program? That is a legislative enactment of a pay increase, and I do not see how the Committee on Appropriations could possibly fail to approve the money that Congress has voted in pay for Government workers and servicemen.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is correct. There is no comparability, as I see it, between authorizations and uncontrollable items such as we have in the bill.

CIVILIAN PERSONNEL

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, if my memory serves me correctly, when President Johnson was faced with a similar situation he put a freeze on all new jobs in the Federal Government. There were no new jobs created, and no new jobs filled for at least 6 months or a year.

I was wondering if there was any agreement like that, perhaps, to help meet some of the additional costs if indeed we are going to be faced with a \$15 billion deficit?

Mr. MAHON. I will undertake to place into the RECORD what has been done with regard to the personnel. In some areas it has gone down, and in other areas it has gone up. I will put some facts on the subject in the extension of my remarks.

Mr. Chairman, may I add for the record that there are various statistical data published regularly on Federal employment. Executive branch employment has been trending downward in the current fiscal year.

The monthly report of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Federal Expenditures for March 1970—a summary of which I placed in the RECORD on May 4 at page E3843—shows a reduction in overall executive branch civilian employment from last June through this past March of about 65,000. In 7 months there were reductions; in 2 months there were increases, reflecting seasonal and other temporary factors. But the aggregate is down by some 65,000.

Limiting the figures to full-time employment, last June there were 2,633,000 employees in the executive branch. In March 1970, there were 2,572,000, a reduction of about 61,000. The March figure is considerably under the budget planned figure for June 1970.

Some detail by agencies and departments of the changes is given in my remarks in the May 4 RECORD.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. BOW asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Texas, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations (Mr. MAHON) has reported on this bill and has given us a very fine explanation of the details. There is little left for me to add.

But I do say to the gentleman from Illinois, who is concerned about the reduction in the number of personnel, that I

do not have the figures before me. However, I am sure that the gentleman from Texas, who puts out these lists each month, could recall that there were many suggestions made about how the previous administration was going to reduce employment. But employment still continued to grow.

Now, I do not believe we are going to have a \$15 billion deficit. That is certainly not anticipated. There has been some indication that we may expect a slight surplus under the unified budget, and this is a different situation than we have had in the past.

The gentleman from Texas has also made a point with respect to the use of the unified budget. However, if you examine the unified budget, the same budget we are using now, in the last year of the Johnson administration, you find we had a deficit of \$25 billion. Therefore the problem is not the unified budget, and when you talk about the increase in the public debt, and the increase in interest, you must also go back and look at the deficits of the previous administration. Past deficits are the reason we are faced with this public debt situation today. It isn't the use of a unified budget.

Now, the gentleman from Texas has also referred to the limitation on designated uncontrollables. I am concerned about this limitation, although I will support it. Any ceiling on uncontrollables is almost a contradiction in terms. Let us look at our experience in 1970—and I might say that I supported this kind of limitation for that year. Our experience with that ceiling on uncontrollables should have certainly taught us the lesson that we cannot do much with these items. By the time President Nixon took office and submitted his revised budget last April the amounts for these items had been increased by at least \$1.6 billion over the original Johnson budget submitted 3 months earlier.

By this February, when the 1971 budget was submitted, the estimate for 1970 uncontrollables had been revised again by adding at least another \$4.3 billion.

Further increases are now apparent. No ceiling is going to prevent these costs from increasing. Only a responsible fiscal policy that is adhered to for a number of years will ultimately correct this problem.

However, a ceiling may help to focus attention on what is going on. It does mean that every time a further adjustment is made we are reminded of what is happening.

As the budget director told us on April 13, the interest on the public debt was estimated at \$16.8 billion in January, 1969. By February, 1970, it had risen to \$18.8 billion and it now looks like as if that estimate must be further increased by \$400 million.

No one has any real control over these designated items in the budget. I think it is almost futile to put a ceiling on these uncontrollables.

May I also comment on the latest estimate I have received of the cost of interest on the national debt. Take your watch and look at the sweep-second hand. Every time it goes around—each minute—you will have paid \$35,769 for

interest on this debt. Those who are interested in cities and in other spending issues, should consider that \$35,769 that you are now paying every minute for interest. Think of what you could do with those moneys.

So this deficit spending must come to an end. We have to do something to try to and reduce this debt. The amount is now some \$374 billion. Do you realize how much that is? The gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONAS) has an example which he has used in the past and which I have used that illustrates the sharp difference between a million dollars and a billion dollars. If you were to give your wife a million dollars and tell her to go and spend \$1,000 a day she would be back in 3 years for more money. But, if you gave her a billion dollars and told her to go and spend \$1,000 a day—\$1 billion—you would not see her again for 3,000 years.

This is how much of a difference there is between a million dollars and a billion dollars. Our debt is \$374 billion.

We must begin to reduce this debt so that instead of using these moneys for interest on the debt, we can begin to use them for the benefit of the American people.

Again I say I support this bill, and I hope the bill will pass without amendment. We have now been notified that there is going to be an amendment offered which was never considered in the committee. We knew nothing about this amendment until we came to the floor today, and I hope the Members will defeat it when it is offered.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I am looking at the appropriation provision on page 5 of the bill, "Commission on Population Growth and the American Future."

How long has this Commission been in operation, without having produced a program?

Mr. BOW. I would ask the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONAS) to respond to that. It is in his bill.

Mr. GROSS. I am asking about this Commission on Population Growth and the American Future, and why \$700,000 should be carried over or transferred without a program having been provided to the committee—which apparently is the reason. Why not just cut it out until they come up with a program rather than continue the \$700,000 for it?

Mr. JONAS. I did not hear the gentleman's original question.

Mr. GROSS. Why is the \$700,000 being carried over, apparently protected by a waiver of a point of order? Why not just withhold the \$700,000 until they come up with a program? How long have they been in operation without providing a program?

Mr. JONAS. This is a brand new organization. It is a subject about which a considerable amount of current discussion is going on. They had originally requested funding for the entire 3 years and we reduced that. We did not wish to unduly delay this program because of the extent of current concern, but believed further planning was necessary. This

title in the bill is not protected by a waiver of points of order.

Mr. GROSS. My question is, Why not cut out the \$700,000 until they provide a program? Why should it be continued? That is the point I am trying to make.

I note there is \$200 million-plus for the Inter-American Development Bank. It seems to me that the time is coming when we are going to have to stop appropriating to these international financial institutions. It seems to me a savings could have been made there without a bit of trouble. I do not understand \$2 million more for the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities. Did they not receive \$20 million last year?

Mr. BOW. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. Why another \$2 million for that?

Mr. BOW. I believe this is for the pay increase.

Mr. GROSS. It seems to me this is one place where they could certainly have chopped off some employment to take care of the \$2 million.

Mr. BOW. I would like to correct the statement I made. The \$2 million is not for the pay increase.

Mr. GROSS. What did you say?

Mr. BOW. I had said to the gentleman that this amount was to take care of a pay increase, and I was in error. It is not a pay increase. It is an additional appropriation.

Mr. GROSS. So it is another handout of \$2 million?

Mr. BOW. The funds are to match gifts made from private corporations.

Mr. GROSS. Is that not nice? How helpful is it? It just causes us to put up another \$2 million. We are talking about controlling the outflow of money from the Federal Treasury, trying to stop inflation, and it is not going to be stopped this way, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. RHODES).

(Mr. RHODES asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Chairman, I am informed that there will be an amendment offered by my good friend from Massachusetts which will have approximately the same effect as the various amendments might have had to the military authorization bill which we passed on yesterday had those amendments been adopted. I am sorry the gentleman intends to offer the amendment, but I recognize his sincerity and his right to do as he pleases. I am sure that he feels strongly, and as a Member of Congress doing his duty, he feels constrained to do this.

There were no such amendments offered at the time the American forces in Vietnam were increased from the 653 in Vietnam when President Eisenhower left office, over 16,000 by the late President Kennedy.

There were no such limitations offered when President Lyndon B. Johnson decided to bomb North Vietnam. In so doing he extended the war to North Vietnam a real escalation, but there were no such limitations offered which would have had the effect of inhibiting the freedom of the Commander in Chief of

the Armed Forces of the United States, in conducting the war which he felt was authorized by the Gulf of Tonkin resolution adopted by the Congress of the United States. There were no such limitations offered when this same President raised our troop level in Vietnam from time to time until it reached 546,000, as it was when President Nixon was inaugurated.

In my opinion this limiting amendment, if adopted, would have the effect of inhibiting this President of the United States in conducting the operations in Southeast Asia which were authorized by the Congress under the Gulf of Tonkin resolution.

Let me say first that I am no hawk. As a matter of fact, I do not think anybody wants to end this war in Vietnam any more quickly or urgently than I do. I have one very personal reason for wanting to end the war, in the shape of my son, who is now serving as a captain in military intelligence in Vietnam. I have other, and perhaps even better, though less personal, reasons for wanting to end it. I feel very strongly that the world will little note nor long remember who controls Southeast Asia, but I think the world may long remember what was done in this particular period in history to keep the United States of America strong in all areas of defense, so that no enemy with more sophisticated weapons than those possessed by the North Vietnamese or any other such country might, by miscalculation, think it could earn a cheap victory over us and thereby find its way to world domination.

To me that type of preparation is the most urgent duty which faces the President of the United States of America today. That is the main reason why I yield to no one in my desire to get out of the Vietnamese involvement just as rapidly as we can, because the effort and treasure spent there could and should be spent in deterring and preventing a conflict much more deadly to our Nation and to the entire world than the one in Vietnam.

Let us look at the situation as we find it, because we cannot change it. Whether we like it or not, we are in Vietnam. If we decided today to get out of Vietnam, we could not possibly do it for weeks and months, because the physical facilities for moving that many troops and their equipment are not available. So we might as well look at the situation as it is.

I was in Vietnam about a month ago. I started with the IV Corps in the Mekong Delta, and I went to the III Corps, to the II Corps, to the I Corps along the DMZ. I also went into Laos and spent 2 days in that country. I intend to report to the House at greater length, when it becomes possible for me to have the time free from Appropriations Committee hearings to prepare it properly.

I am pleased to report to the House now, however, that I have never seen and I do not think anybody else has ever seen finer troops or a better equipped Army, Navy, and Air Force than I saw in Vietnam. I never have seen better morale among fighting men than I saw among the American men in South Vietnam. I never have seen people more dedi-

cated to the task they were performing or better able to perform that task than I saw among the troops wearing the uniform of the United States of America in South Vietnam.

I can also report that a very definite part of their everyday life, their routine and objective, is Vietnamization. Major General Wright, the distinguished commanding general of the 101st Airborne Division a division well known for its fighting qualities, but not so well known for its peaceful pursuits, was most emphatic in telling me that his main mission today is Vietnamization, that he is responsible for training the popular forces and the regional forces in South Vietnam so that they may take over and keep the country free once the Americans have gone.

I saw this all. Vietnamization is working. The 1st South Vietnamese Infantry Division, is an outfit which can stay on anybody's battlefield, and any American officer will tell you this is so.

There are several other Vietnamese divisions which are almost up to that stage of training. So we are seeing the plans of President Nixon to get the United States out of Vietnam, by Vietnamization, working. They are working. Vietnamization is working. But it does take time.

It has been well said by many of us here on this floor and many people who are not Members of this body that the proof of the pudding on Vietnamization will come in some few months when the second 150,000 troop increment has been removed from that country. Remaining in the country will be American troops—mainly communications, maintenance, and supply troops. This is when the danger may come. This is when the North Vietnamese may decide they can strike quickly at our diminished force, humiliate the United States of America, and earn a cheap victory. The real metal of the South Vietnamese will be tested, when they try to defeat this attack, which I predict will come from the North Vietnamese, at the time when the balance of American troops in South Vietnam is such that the people who are the rulers of North Vietnam will deem the time proper and right for the success of such a mission.

The President of the United States knows this. The Secretary of Defense knows it. Practically everybody who is in the defense business in the Congress knows it. We have been worried about this fateful day when we might be faced with that type of situation. We all want to do everything possible to insure that this attack, when it comes, will be unsuccessful.

The neighboring nation of Cambodia for many months has been an unwilling sanctuary for troops of North Vietnam. At the end of the Ho Chi Minh Trail and the Sihanouk Trail supplies were cached, in South Vietnam at first but later also in Cambodia, in a sanctuary which our troops and allies did not hit. They did not hit it because Cambodia was a neutral nation. So as a result the supplies were built up in these areas, and as a result those areas of South Vietnam to Cambodia, particularly in the IV Corps Mekong Delta, became strong-

holds of the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese.

Not too many months ago the situation changed, because Prince Sihanouk, then the ruler of Cambodia, was able to see that his people did not like the idea of so many Vietnamese being on their territory. He could see there were so many of them and they were so well equipped that they were a danger to his own regime. So he started to cut off the supplies which came through the port of Sihanoukville. He asked Russian and China to order the North Vietnamese to leave.

Later on, as we know, when he left the country, he was overthrown and another government came in, which not only continued to cut off the supplies at Sihanoukville but also cut off the Sihanouk Trail. They let it be known they expected the North Vietnamese and the Vietcong to quit using Cambodia as a sanctuary.

This put the North Vietnamese to the test, because they had some pretty agonizing decisions to make. One alternative, of course, was to withdraw troops before they used up their supplies and get them out of danger. A second alternative was to stay in place and try to supply their people as they now are. A third alternative is to attack, widen their area of domination, and increase their supply systems capability. Soon, movements of North Vietnamese into the interior of Cambodia, and toward Sihanoukville, made it apparent that Hanoi had chosen the third alternative, and were trying to turn Cambodia into a real supply and operations bastion of communism.

Such a bastion would outflank the Mekong Delta and the Saigon area. The delta situation had so improved that American troops had been pulled out. The improvement had accelerated after the closing of Sihanoukville.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arizona has expired.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. RHODES. Sihanoukville supplied the IV Corps, which is the Mekong Delta of Vietnam, and the III Corps, which is the area in which Saigon is located, with many goods and supplies. In fact, we are told that the IV Corps got 75 percent—of its supplies and equipment through Sihanoukville, and the III Corps got 50 percent of its supplies and equipment through Sihanoukville. Thus, this was a very important port. No wonder the North Vietnamese would be most anxious to reopen it.

So the thing which they did, after they were faced with this decision, was to widen the area which they occupied in Cambodia to start a drive in the general direction of Sihanoukville.

It was at this time and this time only that the President of the United States and, I am sure, the President of South Vietnam went through a rather agonizing reappraisal. As long as the troops who occupied these sanctuaries were in relatively small pockets, there was not an overwhelming danger that could not be contained, even by our diminished forces after the 150,000 troop withdrawal, and the South Vietnamese. Now, when you start connecting those pockets, and building it up into a continuous chain

of supply depots, increasing the capacity of the Ho Chi Minh Trail, then it becomes apparent that Cambodia is about to become a real arsenal for attack against the South Vietnamese and the remaining Americans. It was at this time and at this time only that the President of the United States and the President of South Vietnam came to the conclusion that this was a risk to the lives of our men which they could not and would not take. So, as a result, the operation which is now in progress was decided upon, and begun.

Now let us look at the North Vietnamese. Many people are saying that the United States is an invader and an aggressor in Cambodia. Let us deny that right now, because the North Vietnamese are the aggressors. They are the ones who are there illegally. Nobody asked the United States and South Vietnam to get out of Cambodia. They have asked the North Vietnamese to do so. So, if there is any law involved, it is on our side.

It is also being said that we made this move because we want military victory. I say this is not true. They are there because they want military victory. They are not talking in Paris because they want military victory not a negotiated settlement. The Nixon administration has not changed its previous pronouncements that what we are doing in South Vietnam is trying to create a climate whereby the South Vietnamese themselves can choose and keep the type of government which they, the South Vietnamese, want. I recognize the fact that the gentleman from Massachusetts' amendment will apply only to fiscal year 1971, which begins after July 1. However, it has been well said—and the President of the United States said it himself—that these American troops will be out of Cambodia before June 30. What assurance do we have that if we give an open invitation like this for the North Vietnamese to return to those areas, they will not do it? What you are doing here, then, is to say, "All right, Mr. Nixon. You go ahead and blow up the privileged sanctuaries and the bunkers and confiscate the supplies and all that, but only in fiscal year 1970. After that you will get out and you cannot go back. You cannot go back under any conditions." But you say to the North Vietnamese that they can come back and use this again as a privileged sanctuary, from which to attack and kill our diminished forces.

I submit to you that this makes no sense. If we are going to put up with that kind of thinking, which caused the situation which occurred on the floor yesterday—and I am afraid which will occur here today—then maybe the Congress of the United States ought to look at its hole card and realize that we are actu-

ally giving encouragement to the enemies of this country which they do not deserve. We are prolonging the war, not helping to end it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. RHODES. We are making it possible for them actually to increase the number of American casualties in South Vietnam instead of decreasing them.

Mr. Chairman, I will close by saying what I said when I started out. There is nobody who wants to get out of South Vietnam any faster than I do, but I want to get out after accomplishing the national objective by taking the process of Vietnamization through to its culmination, which will be when the South Vietnamese really can defend themselves against North Vietnamese aggression. I am satisfied that we will be able to do it, and we are all working toward that end. The morale of the South Vietnamese is magnificent.

When I was there in 1964, every South Vietnamese I met gave me the impression that he thought every North Vietnamese was 9 feet tall and there was not any possibility that they could be defeated by the South Vietnamese on the battlefield or any other way. But, now it is different. They have confidence. They know they can do the job because we have helped them get the arms and equipment with which to get the job done.

Mr. McCLOSKEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. McCLOSKEY. I am disturbed about the question as to the estimate as to how long it will take Vietnamization to work.

Mr. RHODES. I only yield to the gentleman for a question.

Mr. McCLOSKEY. Let me give the gentleman the question.

The present strength of the South Vietnamese under arms is 1.2 million men. The strength of the North Vietnamese and Vietcong has never exceeded 270,000. We have about a 4-to-1 or 5-to-1 strength advantage today and we have at least a 4-to-1 superiority in numbers along the Vietnam and Cambodian border.

How long does the gentleman feel it will take for the Vietnamese in the III and IV Corps areas to be successful so that the South Vietnamese can hold off this smaller number of North Vietnamese?

Mr. RHODES. I do not wish to play the numbers game. All I can say to the gentleman from California is that the South Vietnamese have made great strides in their training and in their equipment. They are much better now than they

were in 1964 when they had 700,000 men under arms. They are making a great effort and they are united in their purpose. I believe they will succeed, and do so in a reasonable time.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. MAHON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

TROOPS IN CAMBODIA

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I understand that an amendment will be offered relating to the utilization of American troops in Cambodia. I further understand that certain substitute amendments may be offered.

My feeling is that we ought to have a sharp up or down vote on the issues involved.

It has been suggested by some that we might have a limitation offered to the title V expenditure limitation reading about like this:

Of which expenditures none shall be available for use by American combat forces in Cambodia, unless the President shall report to the Congress that such ground forces are necessary to protect the lives of the American troops remaining within South Vietnam.

I believe the House ought to vote down all amendments of this type. We should not undertake to fix war strategy on this appropriation bill.

The President as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces is committed to take all appropriate steps to save American lives and bring the war to an honorable conclusion at the earliest possible date.

I would think that a vote for an amendment of the character which is being proposed would represent a vote of no confidence in the President. I do not believe that such an amendment would be meaningful or helpful. I think it would tend to worsen our already complex and difficult situation.

Mr. Chairman, I appeal for the support of the House.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. I quite agree with the gentleman. I would hope that we could face this one issue, the amendment that is going to be offered, as it is and without watering it down. Let us face right up to this question. I hope that no additional amendments or substitutes will be offered, so that we can vote this question up or down.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. Let me state to the gen-

tleman from Texas that I appreciate what he has just said and agree completely. I believe that the ranking member of the committee feels likewise. Those of us who have firm convictions on this matter should stand fast and not in any way do differently than we did on yesterday.

Mr. MAHON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak to the portion of this bill that provides a supplemental appropriation of \$7.1 million for Point Reyes National Seashore.

As you know this has been a long-term project with me and I am delighted that we have finally come so close to realizing the completion of this project.

I would like to commend my colleague and good friend, the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. HANSEN), chairwoman of the Interior Appropriations Subcommittee, for her good efforts on behalf of this project. I appreciate her farsightedness and wisdom in recognizing the importance of this project by approving the allocation of these funds. Her assistance has been of inestimable value and of the utmost importance in getting adequate moneys for Point Reyes. I applaud her committee's realization of the need for this money for "the emergency acquisition of properties that otherwise might slip into subdivision."

Reference here is made to two prime properties, the Lake Ranch and the Pierce Ranch, encompassing a total of almost 5,000 choice acres of Point Reyes. Without these funds, purchases of these properties will be impossible and these lands will fall victim to subdivision. This would certainly be a tragedy in the truest sense, most especially since, the Administration has already approved the appropriation of funds needed for this purchase. In addition, these funds will be used to begin acquisition of several other properties vital to the Point Reyes picture.

I respectfully request the approval of these moneys and again extend my sincere thanks to the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. HANSEN) and her capable subcommittee for their good efforts for this project.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I should like to comment upon three programs which are funded under the second supplemental appropriation bill—H.R. 17399—housing, contract compliance, and civil rights education.

HOUSING: SECTIONS 235 AND 236

Title I of H.R. 17399, the second supplemental appropriation bill for fiscal year 1970, contains urgently needed funds for the section 235 low-income homeownership program and the section 236 rental housing assistance program. An additional \$35 million is appropriated for each.

This action by the Appropriations Com-

mittee in recommending these moneys is to be commended. The administration requested supplemental appropriations of only \$25 million for each program—clearly far too little. The committee has recommended funding in excess of these requests.

I am particularly gratified at this action because of the urgent need of New York City for section 236 funds. As I testified on April 8 before the Subcommittee on Independent Offices and Department of Housing and Urban Development in regard to supplemental appropriations:

The problem of lack of sufficient housing (in New York City) cannot even be generously described as a clear and present danger. The problem is with us today, and it is a fullblown, very real crisis.

I would also note with special interest that the committee's action is a welcome response to my testimony before the subcommittee in support of H.R. 15643—companion bills H.R. 15729 and 15844—which I introduced with a total of 26 co-sponsors joining me, and which provided full funding for the section 235 and 236 programs. In addition, I introduced H.R. 15644, which provides full funding for section 236 alone.

The committee's recommendations fall short of the full authorization for section 236 by \$10 million and are short for section 235 by \$5 million; \$40 million for section 235 and \$45 million for section 236 would have brought the moneys appropriated for the two programs up to their fully authorized levels.

The backlog of feasible section 236 projects totals \$75 million—that is, there are projects requiring \$75 million of section 236 funds which have been analyzed and determined to be feasible, the only lack being money. The backlog of feasible projects for the New York City area alone—the city and surrounding counties—amounts to \$20 million.

I believe that the Committee on Appropriations, by its support of the supplemental appropriations bills which I introduced, has shown a recognition of the dire crisis in housing which exists in the Nation, and I hope that the committee's future actions will work towards the alleviation of that crisis.

At this point, I include in the RECORD the testimony which I gave on April 8 before the Subcommittee on Independent Offices and Department of Housing and Urban Development of the Committee on Appropriations. The testimony follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF NEW YORK—APRIL 8, 1970

Mr. Chairman, I am appearing today before this subcommittee to testify in regard to the supplemental appropriations requests submitted by the President on March 12, 1970,

for the sections 235 and 236 programs, and to urge that supplemental appropriations for the urban renewal and rent supplement programs also be favorably considered.

Twenty-six members joined me in three bills—H.R. 15643, 15729, and 15844—which would provide for increasing the fiscal year 1970 section 235 appropriation by \$40 million, the section 236 appropriation by \$45 million, the urban renewal programs appropriation by \$400 million, and the rent supplement program appropriation by \$68 million. These supplemental appropriations would fund these programs to their full authorized levels. I also introduced H.R. 15644, which provides for full funding of the section 236 program alone.

The administration's actions in responding to the needs which these bills meet is inadequate. The request submitted by the President was limited only to section 235 and 236, and asked only for an additional \$25 million for each program. The fact that the administration's requests for fiscal year 1971 provide for full funding of these two programs does not alter, or ameliorate, the urgent need for these funds now, as well as for the funds for the urban renewal and rent supplement programs.

Urban renewal is at the very core of the governmental effort to clear our Nation's slums and halt urban blight. Decay of our cities is not going to stand still awaiting adequate Federal funds to combat it; it continues, it persists, and it grows in severity. It is no exaggeration to say that every day of delay creates that much more which must be done tomorrow. The onus will not be lifted by ignoring it; it will only grow. Money is essential, and must be appropriated. Currently, there is a backlog of applications submitted to the Department of Housing and Urban Development for urban renewal projects amounting to \$3 billion.

The rent supplement program is designed to make it possible for non-Government sponsors to house, with Federal assistance, low-income families, who pay a maximum of 25 percent of their monthly income for rent. The program, if effectively and fully implemented, can achieve multiple beneficial results. The program encourages the construction of needed housing for low-income families. It brings private enterprise into the low income housing field. And it achieves a measure of economic integration within individual projects—families of different incomes and ages can live together.

Currently, the backlog of requests for rent supplement funds totals \$18,543,520. At a per unit annual cost of \$640—the figure estimated by the Department of Housing and Urban Development—this means 28,974 units. What is more, were the money available, requests totalling millions of additional dollars would immediately be forthcoming, once the availability of the funds became known.

Consequently, I would strongly urge that the subcommittee favorably consider supplemental funding for the urban renewal and rent supplement programs. Both fill urgent needs, and response to these needs cannot continue to be foresworn or delayed.

Similarly, the need for funds for sections 235 and 236 is a very real and a very urgent one. The full amounts that could be appropriated for fiscal year 1970—\$40 million for section 235 and \$45 million for section 236—are required today. If appropriated, they

could be immediately employed; \$40 million would fund 43,956 units under section 235; \$45 million would fund 45,000 units under section 236.

The Department of Housing and Urban Development has reported to me that there is, right now, a \$37 million backlog of section 235 requests. This backlog is for short-term requests—that is, requests which are ready now for funding and which could be funded now if money were available.

The same massive need for funds exists for the section 236 program. So far, this fiscal year, section 236 reservations for New York City alone have been made by FHA for only 6,556 dwelling units, at a total cost of \$9,425,932. Of these 6,556 units, 3,341 are New York City Mitchell-Lama projects. The other 3,215 are straight FHA projects, for which the FHA reservations amount to \$5,197,894 of the total of \$9 million plus.

Twelve additional projects are ready to be started; these represent the New York City Housing Development Administration's top priority requirements. The total amount necessary for them from FHA is \$5,400,000. In addition, the housing development administration estimates that, if there were funds available for commitment from FHA, approximately 3,000 more units could be started in fiscal year 1970 alone.

These figures only portray the need for section 236 funds in New York City. The backlog of feasible projects for the New York City area alone—the city and surrounding counties—amounts to \$20 million. And the nationwide demand multiplies this need enormously. The Department of Housing and Urban Development reports a backlog for section 236 programs amounting to \$167 million. Of this amount, \$75 million is needed for projects which are ready to go right now—they have already been analyzed, sites have been found, the projects have been determined to be feasible.

I want to briefly describe the section 235 and 236 programs. I am sure you all have familiarity with them, but perhaps a brief recapitulation will help illustrate their importance even further.

Under the section 235 homeownership for lower income families program, which was enacted by passage of the 1968 Housing and Urban Development Act, the homeowner pays 20 percent of his income toward payment of his mortgage. But in no case can the payment exceed the difference between the required payment under the mortgage for principal, interest, and the mortgage insurance premium, and the payment that would be required for principal and interest if the mortgage bore an annual interest rate of 1 percent.

The following charts give a picture of the average family for whom mortgages were written during the last quarter of 1969.

Average age of family head.....	32
Average size of family.....	5
Number of female heads.....	1 out of 4
Average gross annual income (not including income of minors)....	\$5,647
Average total assets.....	\$290
Average unit sales price.....	\$15,029
Average mortgage amount.....	\$14,850
Average sales price—new home....	\$15,582
Average sales price—existing house..	\$13,879

The typical payment by the mortgagor in the last quarter of 1969 was \$79, with a subsidy from the Department of Housing and Urban Development of \$54, making an average total mortgage payment of \$133.

Last session, the appropriation for contract authority under section 235 was increased by Congress by \$900 million. This still leaves a gap of \$40 million below the full authorized level. Since the estimated annual cost per unit is \$910, according to the Department of Housing and Urban Development, a supplemental appropriation of this \$40 million would enable an additional

43,956 units to be funded. The administration's request for only \$25 million reduces this number of units to 27,472—a decrease of some 16,500.

While it is commendable and proper that the administration requested in its fiscal year 1971 budget full funding for section 235, there is no need, and no justification, for delaying. The full amount that could be appropriated for fiscal year 1970—\$40 million—is needed right now. The thousands of people who account for the current backlog of \$37 million should not be told that they must wait until next year's appropriation makes its way through committee hearings, the House and the Senate, and then the President's desk. Therefore, while I urge that, at the least, this subcommittee act favorably on the administration's \$25 million supplemental appropriation request, I would even more strongly urge that it act to recommend the full possible—\$40 million—proposed in the three bills which I have introduced.

Of special importance to New York City is the section 236 program. For this reason, I not only introduced the three bills to which I have alluded requesting full funding for several housing programs, but I also introduced, on January 29, H.R. 15644, which seeks full funding for section 236 alone. Since section 235 does not really help New York City's apartment-dwelling population, it is the section 236 rental housing assistance program which offers the chief subsidy to moderate-income families seeking adequate housing.

Section 236, enacted by passage of the 1968 Housing and Urban Development Act, provides for assistance to families for rental or cooperative housing in the form of periodic payments to the mortgagee on behalf of the mortgagor. These payments serve to reduce interest costs on a market-rate project down to that which have to be paid if the mortgage bore an interest rate of 1 percent. The tenant pays no more than 25 percent of his income per month for rent.

Last session, Congress increased the section 236 contract authority by \$85 million. This was \$45 million less than the amount by which the contract authority could have been increased if the full authorization level were to be reached.

The full possible appropriation of \$45 million would enable subsidizing 45,000 more units this fiscal year, the estimated annual per unit cost being \$1,000 according to the Department of Housing and Urban Development. Consequently, the administration's failure to request full funding means that only 25,000 units could be funded—a full 20,000 less than the maximum.

As an example of the uses to which section 236 funds are put in New York City, I would point to Linden Plaza, a 1,557-unit cooperative housing project underway in Brooklyn for individuals and families with annual incomes between \$4,000 and \$8,500. Linden Plaza utilizes section 236 funds, and funds available under New York State's Mitchell-Lama law, which provides that the State or a city can make low-interest, long-term loans to limited-profit sponsors of moderate-income housing.

Linden Plaza's 703,560-square-foot site, located in the East New York section of Brooklyn, uses vacant land and air rights over city-owned storage yards. Four 17-story apartment buildings and 32 single-family two-story townhouses will be erected. One 20-story building containing commercial, professional, and residential space also is a part of the project, which, in all, will have 163 efficiency apartments, 587 one-bedroom units, 556 two-bedroom units, and 251 three-bedroom units.

The development, which will cost an estimated \$42 million, will receive a 50-year, \$40,350,000 mortgage loan under the Mitchell-Lama program. FHA will pay the city the difference between 1 percent and the total in-

terest charged on the permanent mortgage, for which FHA has reserved \$1,523,052 of section 236 funds to pay the first year's subsidy.

This combined local and Federal assistance will enable families and individuals to purchase cooperative shares in Linden Plaza for down-payments averaging between \$275 and \$300 per room and monthly carrying charges of approximately \$29 per room. Without the section 236 assistance, per room monthly carrying charges would run about \$45.

On December 11, 1968, the President's Committee on Urban Housing recommended a 10-year goal of 26 million more new and rehabilitated housing units. The Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968 embraced this goal, and stated:

"The Congress affirms the national goal as set forth in section 2 of the Housing Act of 1949, of a 'decent home and a suitable living environment for every American family.'"

"The Congress finds that this goal has not been fully realized for many of the Nation's lower income families; that this is a matter of grave national concern; and that there exist in the public and private sectors of the economy the resources and capabilities necessary to full realization of this goal."

The second annual report of the President on housing tells us:

"Housing production in the past year, and over the last 4 years has been more than 1 million units short of the volume needed to keep pace with the Nation's growing population and replace inevitable losses of dwellings. Insufficient progress has been made in replacing or rehabilitating some 6 million substandard units. Too many other units continue to be allowed to slip into disrepair."

Let me just outline the situation in New York City, which is especially dire, but which reflects the problems throughout the country and particularly in our major urban centers.

Only 3,000 new apartments were built without Government assistance in New York City last year, and there are no prospects for an increase in 1970. Only seven new apartment buildings opened in Manhattan, and only three are projected for 1970. Three building completions, with 662 units, would be the second lowest figure since World War II.

Not a single permit for private apartment construction in Brooklyn was issued in the first 6 months of 1969. In the Bronx, Queens, and Staten Island permit requests ranged between 200 and 300 units, and in Manhattan the total was 1,250.

Dr. Frank S. Kristof, who was New York City's chief housing economist for 6 years and who now holds a similar position in the State's Urban Development Corp., has estimated that family formations in the early 1970's will run at 20,000 a year. Demolitions of apartment units is currently running at 10,000 a year, and abandonments at 30,000 a year. Thus, with current production at 3,000 a year in the private sector and 17,000 in the public—a total of 20,000—the current annual deficit is an astounding 20,000 units.

For the first time in the 300-odd years of the city's history, New York's available housing is shrinking. Twenty thousand families a year will either have to double up in already occupied apartments or have to leave the city to face the suburban housing shortage and suburban costs. The problem of lack of sufficient housing cannot even be generously described as a clear and present danger. The problem is with us today, and it is a full-blown, very real crisis.

The statistics which I have cited can leave no question that the funds being sought by the administration are inadequate. Full funding of the section 235 and 236 programs cannot wait; there must be action now. Thus, while the subcommittee will be taking a commendable step in the right direction by supporting the administration's supplemental appropriations requests, it will be taking an

even more important step if it goes on to recommend an additional \$15 million over and above the administration's \$25 million request for section 235, and an additional \$20 million over the administration's \$25 million request for section 236.

Equally important, the subcommittee, despite the administration's failure to act responsibly and request additional funds, should recommend maximum supplemental appropriations for the other programs funded by H.R. 15643, 14729, and 15844—including the urban renewal program and the rent supplement program.

OFFICE OF FEDERAL CONTRACT COMPLIANCE

The second supplemental appropriation bill for fiscal year 1970, H.R. 17399, severely short changes the equal employment opportunity program mandated by Executive Order 11246, issued by President Johnson on September 24, 1965.

While the request for the Office of Federal Contract Compliance, the central office which governs the Federal equal employment program, was for \$160,000. The Appropriations Committee has reported out in H.R. 17399 a recommended appropriation of only \$107,000. The consequence of this reduction is that the Office of Federal Contract Compliance—OFCC—will only be able to hire an additional 17 employees, rather than the intended 26. Thereby, the OFCC's capability effectively to implement and monitor the Government-wide contract compliance program, which is intended to ensure equal employment opportunity, will be seriously hindered.

Executive Order 11246, which establishes as the administering agency for this program the Department of Labor, of which OFCC is a part, does two things. It prohibits discrimination on the part of all employers with Federal contracts; and it requires that Federal contractors undertake affirmative action "to insure that applicants are employed, and that employees are treated during employment, without regard to their race, creed, color, or national origin." Executive Order 11375 expands this coverage to discrimination on the basis of sex.

Both the nondiscrimination and affirmative action requirements apply to all of the contractor's operations, not just those for the contracted item, and they are specifically incorporated in the terms of the contract between the Government and the contractor. The contractor is also required under the Executive order to first state in all job advertising that he is an equal employment opportunity employer; second, give appropriate notice to the unions with whom he has contracts; third, comply with all orders of the Secretary of Labor, including requirements for information and records and the inspection of books; and fourth, make reference to these commitments in all subcontracts and purchase orders "so that such provisions shall be binding on each subcontractor or vendor."

Under the Executive order, each contracting agency is primarily responsible for obtaining compliance. Since several agencies might be doing business with the same company, the contract compliance program was originally set up on the basis of assigning compliance responsibility to that agency which did the largest dollar volume of business with a given company.

This system has been changed under the present administration, and assignment of responsibility is now on the basis of industrial categories. The administration has also reduced the number of contracting agencies responsible for contract compliance from 26 to 13.

The role of the Office of Federal Contract Compliance, created in January 1966 in the Department of Labor, follows from the section of Executive Order 11246 making the Secretary of Labor responsible for the administration of the order and empowering him to "adopt such rules and regulations and issue such orders as he deems necessary and appropriate to achieve the purposes thereof."

The OFCC has yet effectively to perform its mandated functions. It has moved with unwarranted slowness. Not until 2½ years after its creation did it issue rules and regulations.

Some of the half-hearted efforts of the Office may be laid to political pressures. Last year, the Office attempted to issue a fairly well detailed regulation outlining what constituted affirmative action. However, pressures from a Member of the other body, to which the administration promptly acceded, caused the withdrawal of order No. 4, and the revised order No. 4, which was subsequently issued this past February, is far less explicit and helpful.

But without question one of the major reasons for the Office of Contract Compliance's inability to be more effective and aggressive in injecting vitality and commitment into the languishing equal employment opportunity program is its lack of sufficient staff. The OFCC estimated in 1968 that there were 225,000 contractor facilities subject to the Executive order. The miniscule manpower of the OFCC makes impossible review and supervision of the compliance operations of the various contracting agencies concerning all the contracting companies. But even on a level of less detail, the OFCC is grossly understaffed: it cannot undertake spot checks, review of particularly suspect companies, review of questionable practices, and issuance of adequate rules and regulations.

Certainly, to just increase the staff of the OFCC is not the answer to the Government's failure to effectively and firmly enforce the equal employment opportunity program—a failure glaringly highlighted by the fact that there has never yet been a contract cancellation for noncompliance. The compliance staffs of every contracting agency must be enormously enlarged. But to not sufficiently increase the staff of the OFCC adds that much more of a barrier to beefing up this program and enabling it to realize the potential for momentous change it embodies.

One of the consistent themes running throughout the ad hoc hearings on equal employment opportunity which I conducted in December of 1968 was the absolutely essential need for sufficiently staffing the Office of Federal Contract Compliance. That action has not yet been taken. And it is needed now more than ever, as dramatized by the actions of the Defense Department in conducting its equal employment opportunity program. Last year, Deputy Defense Secretary

Packard accepted oral assurances of compliance from three textile companies in the South which were in noncompliance. The OFCC was not consulted.

Subsequently, the Navy entered into contracts with the Ingalls Shipbuilding Co. in Pascagoula, Miss., totaling \$128 million, even though Ingalls was not in compliance.

On January 1 of this year, the Air Force entered into a contract with McDonnell-Douglas Aircraft Co., and only following hearings held by the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights was McDonnell forced to adopt a new affirmative action plan, which still may be unacceptable, although we do not know because the Defense Department refuses to make that plan public.

In March of this year, the Maritime Administration found that the Newport News Shipbuilding and Drydock Co. was in noncompliance, and yet the company had \$2 billion worth of on-going Defense Department contracts at the time, of which half a billion dollars' worth of performance was still remaining.

It is ineptness and obfuscation and nonenforcement such as that demonstrated by the Department of Defense which requires that the Office of Federal Contract Compliance be fully equipped to supervise effectively the equal employment opportunity program throughout the Government.

Of course, I am not totally satisfied with the uses to which the \$160,000 requested would be put. This money is to be used for staff to develop a program of "identifying problems that need attention, planning programs, evaluating accomplishments, and setting uniform standards for agencies and contractors." This is according to the statement of Assistant Secretary of Labor Arthur A. Fletcher before the Subcommittee on Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare and related agencies of the Committee on Appropriations. It is already more than 4 years since the OFCC was established. The time is long past for firm action, let alone planning and evaluation. Even so, the full appropriation of \$160,000 would be money appropriated for a program sorely undermanned and under-implemented.

Furthermore, the optimum solution would be creation of a new, independent agency, charged not only with contract compliance responsibility for the entire Government, but also for fair employment in the civil service. Until the day such an agency is created, however, the OFCC is the best hope. And it must be staffed, in order that that hope can be better realized.

Therefore, while I am encouraged that at least \$107,000 of additional funding is being appropriated to the Office of Federal Contract Compliance, I would much rather see full funding of the request for \$160,000.

CIVIL RIGHTS EDUCATION PROGRAM

I deeply regret that the Appropriations Committee has reduced by half the supplemental appropriation for the civil rights education program—from the \$10 million requested to \$5 million. Because this program plays a vital role in the process of desegregation, it should receive full and adequate funding.

The civil rights education program is one of the most valuable, productive, and necessary programs conducted by the Office of Education. One of its purposes is to aid school boards in planning and executing desegregation orders. Another purpose, essential to the quality of our school system, is to give special training to teachers who will be assigned to desegregated schools for the first time in their careers. Many of today's teachers will be ineffective and almost incapable of instructing in biracial, multileveled classrooms. There is an obvious need to give additional training to teachers so they may better cope with the problems that may arise.

Of the \$10,000,000 requested, \$6.8 million would have been set aside to provide short-term training at university centers for approximately 10,000 school personnel. Another \$1,850,000 would have been used for grants to be made directly to school boards for such efforts as special training for teachers, modernizing old curriculums, and introducing new programs.

Unfortunately, as the budget request was halved, so will the ultimate effect of this program be halved. Although it has not been determined which segments of the program will be affected by this cut, it is evident that the program will have to be curtailed to a great extent.

It is expected that 1,350 school districts will desegregate in the next school year. Thousands of teachers will be confronted with new experiences in educating children. Education is a delicate process, and teachers need all the possible training and advice in order to meet the challenge. It is regrettable that the Appropriations Committee has not been more responsive to the need for the civil rights education program.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to note that the appropriations bill before us today, H.R. 17399, contains supplemental funds for the section 235 homeownership program.

Under section 235, low-income families are able to obtain federally subsidized home mortgages. The subsidies cover the difference between 20 percent of the family's income and total monthly mortgage costs. As the family's income rises, the subsidy is gradually phased out.

Unfortunately, this program is not making the impact that it should in my State, Minnesota, because of funding limitations. Since the inception of the program, Minnesota has only received enough 235 funds to aid 1,300 families. Thousands more could benefit if Federal subsidies were available.

The following letter from a constituent, Mrs. Raymond Schneider, effectively expresses the importance of section 235 for moderate income families with unmet housing needs:

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

DEAR MR. FRASER: My husband is a postal carrier, who takes home \$95.00 a week. We only have 1 child, but even then it's hard to get along. Rent is so high, and about the time you find a place you can afford, the highway takes the land, and you have to find another cheap dump to live in. Then, a dream happens, we're told that, because we were relocated, and because my husband's salary is below \$6,700.00 a year, we can buy

a house on FHA 235. Well, we found OUR house!!! We signed the purchase agreement, and put earnest money down. We spend a sleepless night, over the excitement of it all. Our child won't be changing schools every few years. We plan what to do with this, and that. Tell our folks the wonderful news. It's all a dream!!! Well, that's what it was, 235 ran out of money. Now comes the tears, and driving by to see if OUR house is sold yet. We tried to get a regular GI or FHA mortgage but that's impossible on my husband's income. I'm unable to work to help out because of illness.

I don't know why I'm really writing to you, except, the system needs changing, and men like you can change them. I don't expect you to get our house for us, but I want you to understand what we, the poor working men go thru!! Help Us!!!

Sincerely,

MRS. RAYMOND SCHNEIDER.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read.

COMMISSION ON POPULATION GROWTH AND THE AMERICAN FUTURE

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count.

101 Members are present, a quorum.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

COMMISSION ON POPULATION GROWTH AND THE AMERICAN FUTURE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the Commission on Population Growth and the American Future, including services as authorized by 5 U.S. 3109, and hire of passenger motor vehicles, \$965,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That \$700,000 of the foregoing amount shall not become available without submission of a program and financial plan by the Commission and approval thereof by the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and House of Representatives.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the pending legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language contained in lines 8 through 12 on page 5 of the pending legislation on the ground that it fails to comply with the provisions of clause 2, rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, wherein paragraph 2 states:

Nor shall any provision in any such bill or amendment thereto changing existing law be in order. . . .

I realize, Mr. Chairman, that substantive legislation can in practice be added to an appropriation bill if it fits within the applicable framework of the Holman Rule but does not impose any additional or affirmative duties. The language—submission of a program and financial plan by the Commission—does in fact impose additional duties on the Commission.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. EVINS) will speak to the point of order.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, this is a most unusual request, in which the budget estimate requested money in a supplemental for the present year and also for 1971 and 1972. In effect, funding is requested for 3 years for a study on population growth and the American future in connection with the census which has been taken this year.

We think this study is important and have recommended a supplemental for the balance of the current year, plus funding for 1971. The Commission should develop its plans, and then come back to the committee and provide us with plans of what they propose to do.

There are two members appointed by the House, two by the Vice President, and the President has appointed John D. Rockefeller as Chairman of the Commission to study population growth and the American future.

They asked for money for 3 years and we recommend funds for the current year and 1971.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I respectfully submit to the gentleman from Tennessee that the question is whether or not this language is subject to a point of order.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. This is a limitation on expenditures and we think it is acceptable.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. O'HARA). The Chair is ready to rule.

The Chair finds that the language cited on page 5, lines 8 through 12, in the opinion of the Chair constitutes legislation in an appropriation bill and the point of order is therefore sustained and the proviso is stricken from the bill.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, at the time we were on page 4, I was in the Chamber and on my feet endeavoring to seek recognition. I have an amendment to offer at page 4, line 17.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to offer my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object—

Mr. VANIK. Will you hear my amendment?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the right to object to hear the amendment read.

Mr. VANIK. I have an amendment, Mr. Chairman, which would insert the following language after the period on page 4, line 17, which would add the following language:

Provided, however, that none of the funds herein appropriated shall be used directly or indirectly as grants or loans to officers or members of the staff of the Inter-American Bank.

I understand that there are over 200 such loans that have been made.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, further reserving the right to object, I cannot think of a better amendment to this particular bill, and I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. VANIK)?

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, in order to protect the bill, I have to object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, I do not know who is being protected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

MEDICAL CARE

For an additional amount for "Medical care", \$109,500,000.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MAHON: On page 5, line 25, strike out "\$109,500,000" and insert "\$113,500,000".

VETERANS MEDICAL CARE

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, this amendment proposes \$4 million for medical care under the Veterans' Administration.

The Committee on Appropriations had gone above the budget in the sum of \$3 million. But it has been indicated that an amendment would be offered to increase the bill by \$4 million. After conferring with members of the legislative committee on veterans' affairs and others I determined that I would offer an amendment to increase the totally still another \$4 million.

I hope my amendment will be reasonably satisfactory to all concerned. The desire of Members is, of course, that adequate hospital facilities be provided for our veterans.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. I have the honor of serving as chairman of the Hospital Subcommittee which has a deep concern, as I am sure all of my colleagues do, that America's veterans receive proper care in our VA hospitals.

Mr. Chairman, our subcommittee has been holding hearings on this issue of funding and staffing VA hospitals. Last December the chairman, Mr. TEAGUE, directed that a comprehensive questionnaire be sent to each of the 166 VA hospital directors because we had received widespread complaints that VA hospitals were understaffed and that there were many other deficiencies in the system. The results of this questionnaire revealed many funding and staffing problems at VA hospitals. Some of the deficiencies have been corrected by subsequent funding, however, it is quite evident that there is a long road ahead before the VA medical program catches up. Two weeks ago my subcommittee held hearings in Florida. We had all the hospital directors from Florida in to testify as well as representatives from the major veterans organizations and State and county veteran officials. It was evident from the testimony that despite these latest funding allocations and what has been promised for fiscal year 1971 there are still problems of major proportions regarding funding and staffing which must be dealt with.

Mr. Chairman, because of inadequate staffing and funding many veterans in Florida are having to wait from 4 to 6

months after they apply to get prosthetic arms and legs and other prosthetic devices. The hospital directors admit that they are in need of additional staffing and some new construction which has been completed has not been activated because of lack of funds. There is a universal need in practically all of the VA hospitals to catch up on the purchase of new patient care equipment which is needed to give modern up-to-date care to our veterans. In Florida the four VA hospitals need \$1.2 million immediately for equipment and maintenance projects.

At the Bay Pines hospital, the subcommittee found that the hospital had a 99-percent occupancy rate and about the lowest staffing ratio of any hospital in the system. The hospital is badly in need of air conditioning and needs to be modernized.

The new 480-bed Gainesville hospital, which was dedicated in 1967, still has not been fully activated largely because of a shortage of funds. This hospital is currently operating about 60 beds short of its capacity and is also short staffed.

The Miami hospital was originally constructed as a thousand-bed hospital. However, there are only 688 beds in operation. This hospital is also underfunded and understaffed.

At the Lake City hospital they are operating 80 fewer beds than authorized. Because of a shortage of funds the orthopedic section of this hospital has been closed since November 1969 and they are over \$353,000 short of funds to operate at a minimal staffing ratio of 1.3 employees to each patient.

Mr. Chairman, Florida hospitals have a capacity to operate almost 500 more beds than they are being allowed to operate. Yet, the State service officer presented testimony indicating that over 1,000 veterans are on various kinds of waiting lists for treatment. The needs are clear but the funds are short.

Mr. Chairman, I urge support of Chairman Mahon's amendment—he is only asking for \$4 million for the remainder of fiscal year 1970 to help our VA hospitals. This is a modest request but it will help with some of the most pressing equipment problems, and I think our Nation's hospitalized veterans deserve this consideration.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, we have conferred with the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TEAGUE), chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and others, and we feel that this is the best that can be done under the circumstances.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that the amendment be agreed to.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may revise and extend their remarks at this point in regard to this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Chairman, I support the very able and distinguished chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs to add \$4 million to the second supplemental appropriation bill of 1970. I

too am a member of the Hospital Subcommittee of which the distinguished and able gentleman from Florida (Mr. HALEY) is chairman. There is justification for grave concern about our VA hospitals throughout the country because they have not been receiving sufficient funds for proper staffing and other operating costs.

Mr. Chairman, even with the additional funding that has been allocated to the South Carolina hospitals they are still \$1.3 million short of the funds they needed for operations this year. Most of these shortages have been made by deferring the employment of personnel and not purchasing much needed modern medical equipment. Another device which the hospital directors have been forced to use is to defer maintenance and repair projects which make a material contribution to providing proper patient care to our hospitalized veterans. Earlier this year, Vietnam veterans in South Carolina were having to wait from 5 to 9 months to have their teeth fixed because the Veterans' Administration lacked over \$200,000 in dental care funds to issue the fee basis dental authorizations. Staffing ratios at both hospitals are below acceptable levels. The Columbia hospital is badly in need of air conditioning and modernization and in response to the chairman's recent inquiry concerning equipment and maintenance and repair funds needed for the remaining months of 1970, they reported they needed over \$135,000. At the Charleston VA hospital, the intensive care unit has not ever been opened because they lacked the funds to staff it. It was constructed and equipped when the new hospital was built at a cost of over \$200,000. Yet it has not had a patient in it. This stands as a prime example of what Chairman Teague indicated in his earlier remarks that over \$20 million of modern medical equipment had been standing idle in the VA hospital system because of lack of personnel. The situation at Charleston as of this day, Mr. Chairman, has not been corrected.

Mr. Chairman, I stand four-square behind Chairman Teague's amendment to raise the appropriation for medical care by \$4 million in the second supplemental appropriation bill for 1970.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the graciousness and courtesy of my colleague, the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON) in offering and sponsoring this \$4 million addition to the badly needed funds for the operation of the VA medical system. It carries out what my own Committee on Veterans' Affairs had ascertained as the minimum needed based on field surveys, and I am happy to have this matter come to this successful conclusion. Again my appreciation, not only to the chairman of the committee, but also to the large majority of Members of the House who had indicated to me their support in this matter.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Chairman, I wholeheartedly support Chairman Teague's amendment to increase medical care in the Veterans' Administration in the second supplemental appropriation bill of 1970. I am a member of the Subcommittee on Hospitals and had the

pleasure of accompanying its chairman, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HALEY), on recent hearings which the committee held in Tampa. Hearing directly from the hospital directors about their needs and hearing from the State and county veteran officials was most revealing to me.

Mr. Chairman, in my home State of Mississippi it took Hurricane Camille to get one of our hospitals somewhat updated. This devastating hurricane severely damaged the Gulfport division of the Biloxi hospital, and it was necessary to evacuate the patients to some of the Florida hospitals. I want to again congratulate the Veterans' Administration and the Department of Defense for the magnificent cooperative performance which they turned in. All of these hospitalized veterans were psychiatric cases and therefore they needed special care—but not one patient suffered any injury while they were being evacuated to other hospitals.

As a result of the hurricane's damage to the hospital emergency funds were allocated to repair the damage and many modernization projects and new equipment items are or will be taken care of in the process.

Mr. Chairman, it is evident from our committee hearings that the Veterans' Administration medical program has not been properly funded for many years and it has not kept pace with rapidly advancing medical technology because they have been deferring the purchase of new equipment and the modernization of space to introduce these new treatment procedures into many VA hospitals. I realize that we cannot get the entire system updated over night, but Chairman TEAGUE has contacted each of the 166 hospital directors within the past few weeks to determine what they require right now in the way of emergency needs. I think the Congress ought to go ahead now and vote the modest request which Chairman TEAGUE is recommending in his amendment.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, I wholeheartedly support the amendment which my colleagues, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON) and the outstanding chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee (Mr. TEAGUE), have offered to the 1970 supplemental appropriations bill. I also serve as a member of the Hospital Subcommittee and I am deeply concerned about the plight of many of our VA hospitals. Despite recent additional funding allocations to many VA hospitals and promises of higher funding next year, there are serious shortages of equipment and personnel today to give proper care to hospitalized veterans. Maintenance and repairs and modernization of many hospitals has been deferred or delayed and funds diverted to other uses because the VA medical budget was not keeping pace with rising medical costs. Just a few weeks ago, the Veterans' Affairs Committee asked each hospital director to furnish a list of urgent and critical items of equipment or maintenance and repair still unfunded the absence of which seriously affects a proper level of patient care which could be acquired in this fiscal year. The VA hospital directors in Texas

reported that over \$400,000 fell in this emergent category. Detailed lists of these needs are a matter of record in the committee offices and I think we should act now on the modest increase which Chairman TEAGUE is recommending.

Mr. Chairman, I also want to point out that the VA hospital in Waco had been scheduled for modernization and air conditioning earlier in this fiscal year but this project has also been on the deferred list for some time even though plans have been ready for bid advertising for some time. I hope that this project will proceed without further delay as last year during the summer months Waco had many days where the temperature was 100 degrees or over. The Bonham VA hospital reported to the committee a few weeks ago that they needed over \$25,000 for much needed equipment which ought to be provided.

The plans have also been completed on the new 750-bed San Antonio hospital but these plans have also been shelved for some time. I hope we can proceed with awarding a construction contract on this project without further delay.

Mr. Chairman, I feel very strongly that we should act favorably on Chairman TEAGUE's proposed amendment as the need is urgent now. There is no need to wait any longer, and I urge every Member to vote this \$4 million dollars to help America's hospitalized veterans get better medical care.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON) to increase by \$4 million the item for Veterans' Administration medical care in the second supplemental appropriations bill of 1970. The total supplemental appropriation for medical care would be increased to \$113,500,000 providing an additional \$4 million for outpatient dental care, treatment to additional veterans, and additional equipment for patient care, after civilian pay increases are subtracted.

The Veterans' Administration hospitals have been operating on inadequate budgets and as a result, the quality of medical care delivered has generally deteriorated. Demands for more hospital space continue to soar as many patients who should be receiving care from VA hospitals, are turned away because of lack of space and put on long waiting lists. Additional funds for operating expenses and for hiring more trained personnel are urgently needed to make it possible for more patients to be admitted and to be taken care of.

I think that it is most important that we provide VA hospitals these additional funds to enable them to supply adequate medical care most necessary to restore the health of our wounded and ill veterans who return from Vietnam and other war zones. It is unforgivable to send men into war zones to fight for our country and then not pay the price of adequate medical care and rehabilitation of the wounded. Furthermore, I believe that it is our duty to continue to provide quality medical care to our older veterans who fought bravely in the Korean conflict and World Wars I and II.

I have received countless letters from my constituents emphasizing the short-

age of hospital facilities and staff at the Veterans' Administration hospital in Miami. The hospital director urgently needs funding for additional equipment, staffing, and operational expenses to meet the rapidly growing medical demands of south Florida. The Miami VA hospital has postponed all maintenance and repair of equipment and facilities which can safely be deferred without danger or additional damage, but this equipment must be functional and in full operation if the hospital is going to meet the needs of the area. There should be at least a minimum of 3 hours of actual nursing time available per patient during a 24-hour period, but at Miami there is less than 2 hours of available nursing time per patient and approximately 50 percent of this is utilized in nonnursing activities because of the lack of an adequate supporting staff.

I urge my colleagues to join with me in supporting this important amendment to increase the funds necessary to assist in providing adequate medical care for the veterans of our wars. With increased casualties resulting from the Vietnam war, more manpower, equipment, and space in VA hospitals continues to be needed at an ever-increasing rate—and it is our obligation to fill this need.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to commend the distinguished chairman of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE of Texas, who has labored for almost 25 years in the forefront of the struggle to achieve adequate benefits and recognition for our Nation's veterans.

As a veteran of World War II, who himself was wounded in combat, and as a recipient of the Silver Star, the Bronze Star, the Purple Heart, and countless other decorations, Congressman TEAGUE has not only a profound insight into our veterans' problems but also a compassionate and humanitarian understanding of the needs and wants of our Nation's veterans.

Chairman TEAGUE and his committee have done a thorough job in investigating the problem of shortage of funds for Veterans' Administration hospitals. After an extensive study conducted over a period of 4 months, Chairman TEAGUE reported that the Veterans' Administration has been forced to absorb over \$27 million in increased costs in the medical program during fiscal year 1970. In an effort to alleviate this situation, the chairman requested the House Committee on Appropriations to increase the funds for operating the Veterans' Administration medical program by \$7 million to cover the last month of fiscal year 1970 which expires on June 30.

The second supplemental appropriation bill has now been reported by the Appropriations Committee, but, unfortunately, only an additional \$3 million has been included to cover the shortage of funds in the Veterans' Administration medical program. Consequently, Chairman TEAGUE is today offering an amendment to add \$4 million more to the bill in order to provide a total of \$7 million to cover the Veterans' Administration medical program deficit.

I support this timely amendment and I want to urge my colleagues in the House

of Representatives to give their bipartisan support to it. The Veterans' Administration medical program is in serious trouble and is in desperate need of the additional bare-minimum funding which the chairman is seeking in order to insure modern and up-to-date medical care for our veterans.

Our Nation's veterans have made a tremendous sacrifice for our country, and, consequently, nothing but the best is good enough for them. They deserve up-to-date medical care, and right now, our commitment to provide this up-to-date care is being thwarted by budgetary limitations.

As the Veterans' Affairs Committee has pointed out, only last October, \$20 million worth of specialized medical facilities were standing idle as a result of cutbacks in much needed funds and personnel to operate them. Construction of vitally needed Veterans' Administration hospitals is being curtailed; supporting services are being reduced; and purchase of replacement equipment is being deferred—all in the Nation's effort to curb inflation.

However, these cuts are being made just at a time when our Veterans' Administration hospital system is being challenged by the growing numbers of disabled Vietnam veterans. The largest hospital program in the world is being forced to operate with only half the personnel-patient ratio of other modern hospitals. The Veterans' Administration average staff ratio is only 1.5 staff members per patient, compared to the community's ratio of 2.65 and the university's 3.5 to 4 per patient. Although the net population gain for the veterans has increased by 6 million since 1965, employment of full-time nurses and doctors remains at the 1966 level. We have 1,000 fewer beds available this year—yet our Vietnam veterans are increasing at a rate of 75,000 a month. Close to 250,000 veterans have received nonfatal wounds; over 12,000 of these men are totally disabled. Due to modern evacuation techniques on the battlefield, an increasing number of soldiers are experiencing and surviving more severe and permanently disabling wounds than ever before. Only 4.4 percent of disabled World War II veterans were rated 100 percent disabled, compared to the Vietnam rate of 12.4 percent. To meet this growing demand, it is imperative that we provide sufficient funds to increase the number of hospital beds in our Veterans' Administration hospitals and to hire the medical staff necessary to treat their wounds.

Our all-important rehabilitation programs—both physical and vocational—also demand a financial commitment. Readjustment to American life is difficult for the Vietnam veteran. Studies indicate that his residual disability is far greater than that experienced by his counterpart in World War II and the Korean conflict. Today he needs a completely new system of rehabilitation to return him more rapidly to civilian status. Good will and hard work are not enough—money and staff are necessary to implement our well-meaning intentions.

A study of the six Veterans' Administration hospitals in my own State of Illinois was recently conducted under

the very able leadership of our distinguished chairman. The results reveal the unhappy state of our Veterans' Administration hospital system today. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. TEAGUE) has done an outstanding job in spearheading the movement to see that our veterans receive the first-rate medical care they so earnestly deserve. His recommendation that the Veterans' Administration general medical hospitals should have a minimum staffing proportion of two employees for each patient and psychiatric hospitals a ratio of at least one-to-one can be regarded as the first step toward assuring the serviceman that we have not forgotten him—that he will continue to receive the finest medical treatment we offer him in gratitude for the sacrifices he has made for our country. The improvements that we hope to make in our hospital program must be credited to our chairman's fine efforts.

Let me briefly describe some of the current difficulties revealed by the committee study that our six Illinois Veterans' Administration hospitals are encountering:

First. Hospital Director Charles M. Turner at Veterans' Administration's Chicago research 500-bed hospital reported a funding deficiency of approximately \$266,000 for fiscal year 1970.

Second. At Chicago's 500-bed West Side Hospital, located in my own Seventh Illinois Congressional District, Director Joseph J. Frankel reported funding deficiencies of more than one and a half million dollars for fiscal year 1970.

Third. Director Marvin A. Chapman of the 1,500-bed Veterans' Administration hospital at Danville reported a deficiency of about \$1 million for fiscal year 1970.

Fourth. Dr. William W. Bourke, Director of the Veterans' Administration's largest psychiatric hospital, the 2,487-bed facility at Downey, Ill., reported a funding deficiency of more than \$217,000 for fiscal year 1970.

Fifth. Dr. Lee H. Schlesinger, Director of the Hines Veterans Administration Hospital, reported a funding deficiency in excess of \$900,000 to operate his 1,500-bed hospital.

Sixth. L. M. Frazier, Jr., Director of the Veterans' Administration's 176-bed hospital at Marion, Ill., reported a funding deficiency in fiscal year 1970 of more than \$370,000.

All these figures add up to the staggering fact that the six Veterans' Administration hospitals serving the Illinois veterans face funding deficiencies in fiscal year 1970 of more than \$4 million to operate about 6,700 hospital beds serving one and a half million Illinois veterans.

I for one do not intend to sit idly by and allow shortsighted policies to destroy a medical program that is absolutely essential for America's veterans. A veteran returning home from a shooting war, suffering from wounds and service-connected disabilities, should not be expected to fight another war against inflation and resulting budgetary limitations, at the expense of his health. The Veterans' Administration hospital modernization program has been deferred, apparently

because of inflation and the resulting budgetary limitations which I have discussed.

The gross understaffing and lack of funds which plague the Veterans' Administration hospitals in Illinois are indicative of the serious plight of the program throughout the country. We cannot permit shortsighted policies to destroy what has long been recognized as a first-rate hospital system. The comprehensive system of medical benefits we provide our serviceman has been traditionally recognized as the measure of our gratitude—and a small tribute at that—for the sacrifices he has made to maintain the freedom of this country we all enjoy. We must remember that it is not only our option but our obligation to make sure the hospital program receives the adequate funds to meet the rising costs and personnel deficiencies which are eroding its previous high standards of care. We cannot achieve a first-rate job with a second-rate budget allocation. Once again, I urge bipartisan support for Chairman TEAGUE's amendment to restore \$4 million for the Veterans' Administration medical program.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, I most heartily support the amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. TEAGUE), which would add \$4 million to the item for Veterans' Administration medical care in the second supplemental appropriations bill of 1970.

Clearly, Mr. Chairman, this is not a partisan matter. We in Congress, on both sides of the aisle, have long been committed to the principle that those serving their country in uniform deserve the finest medical care available. This is particularly applicable to those who have returned home suffering wounds and service-connected disabilities.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there is serious cause to believe that this tradition of the highest quality medical care has been substantially endangered by insufficient funding.

Just a few weeks ago officials of our Massachusetts Veterans' Administration Hospital said that they had funding deficiencies in December of 1969 in their operation of some 4,000 hospital beds serving approximately 300,000 Massachusetts veterans. Although these hospitals and others received some supplemental funding for fiscal 1970 the hospital officials unanimously agreed that substantially increased funding will be necessary to adequately provide complete hospital treatment and medical services to Massachusetts veterans particularly those disabled veterans returning from the Vietnam war.

The distinguished chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, in offering this amendment, has informed the House that the VA hospital program is in serious trouble throughout the country and desperately needs this additional funding. It is my understanding that the increased appropriation will be used to make purchases of vitally needed equipment for VA hospitals.

In my judgment, Mr. Chairman, to permit any reduction or deterioration in the medical care provided to our veterans would be a major disaster in this

country. It would represent an incredible and intolerable neglect of our veterans—particularly our Vietnam veterans who are, tragically, recognized as the most “unwept, unhonored, and unsung” war heroes in all our history. We cannot allow the tragedy of their courageous war service to be compounded by any betrayal, on our part, of the clear national moral commitment to provide them with adequate medical care.

If there ever was an amendment, Mr. Chairman, that embodied simple justice, I submit that Mr. Teague's amendment is it, and I urge its swift and unanimous adoption.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I support the measure which will increase the total appropriation in this bill to \$113.5 million for medical and hospital care programs.

Our veterans' hospitals are underfunded and thus, they are shortchanging our ex-servicemen. A lack of funds results in a lack of trained personnel, a lack of facilities, and a lack of adequate treatment due to the overcrowded conditions.

The war in Vietnam has produced over 13,000 veterans whose wounds have been severe enough to merit a military discharge. In Vietnam 12.4 percent of the wounded have received 100-percent disability ratings—this is compared to 4.4 during World War II and 6.7 percent during the Korean war.

Our veterans' hospitals have not kept pace with the rise in admissions. The Veterans' Administration, with 7,000 fewer beds available this year than last because of a shortage of funds, has fallen back on nursing homes to pick up the caseload spillover. In 1965, 168 nursing homes were used; in 1970, nearly 7,500 nursing homes will be used.

Because of budget restrictions, the veterans' hospitals remain staffed at 1966 levels. As a result, \$20 million worth of facilities are not in use because there is no one to staff them.

California veterans' hospitals illustrate the severity of the situation. They have a funding deficiency of \$5.6 million in this fiscal year. In December 1969, the Los Angeles VA medical complex was approximately \$1 million short of fiscal year 1970 funds for operating expenses, \$244,000 short in salary funds, and \$154,000 short of funds to place veterans in community nursing homes.

The VA hospital at Long Beach is not fully utilizing its facilities due to a lack of funds to properly staff its operation.

Mr. Chairman, our veterans deserve medical care of the finest quality. We must do all that can be done to properly serve America's ex-servicemen.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I strongly support the addition of \$4 million to the bill reported by the House Appropriations Committee for the purpose of providing additional funds for the veterans' hospitals. This will mean a total of \$7 million above the budgeted amount for this fiscal year. We have experienced severe shortages at the hospitals in Huntington, Beckley, Clarksburg, and Martinsburg, and I am pleased that this action is being taken to help during the current fiscal year. I plan to support ef-

forts to obtain additional funds when the fiscal year 1971 appropriation is considered.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

FEDERAL CONTRACT COMPLIANCE AND CIVIL RIGHTS PROGRAM

For an additional amount for “Federal contract compliance and civil rights program, salaries and expenses”, \$107,000.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized.

(Mr. MICHEL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I rise first to answer a question raised earlier in general debate by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PUCINSKI) relative to the number of Federal civilian employees. The gentleman from Illinois made some comment that during the Johnson administration there was some restraints on Federal employment but the record shows that civilian employment in the Federal Government as of December 1963 was 2,650,000, which had grown to 3,062,000 by December 1967 and I am happy to report that by December 1969 there was a reduction of 60,000 to a total of 3,002,000.

There are some other figures, however, of which we cannot be very proud and they have to do with the ever-increasing burden for public welfare. Shortly we will come to the point in this bill under grants to the States for public assistance and we have in this supplemental bill \$146,753,000. This figure added to the already appropriated \$7,351,551,000 brings this total figure for fiscal year 1970 to \$7,498,304,000.

And this, Mr. Chairman, is only the partial story for in the 1971 budget we are now considering an item for grants to the States for public assistance totaling \$8,588,870,000. My good friend, Les ARENDS, the senior member of our Republican side from my neighboring district just advised me a few minutes ago that when he first came to the Congress the entire budget for the whole Government was less than this last figure.

This public assistance item is one of the big “uncontrollables” which the chairman of our committee made reference to during general debate and I might add that the \$50 million item in here for unemployment compensation for Federal employees and ex-servicemen is also an uncontrollable item. This additional amount requested in this supplemental bill is caused by the fact that there have been 158,000 more separations from the service during this fiscal year than was originally planned.

There was another uncontrollable item here in this bill of \$10 million for increased administrative costs for processing unemployment insurance work loads resulting from recent increases

in the number of unemployment claims.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, may I say a word about the Howard University construction item here of \$7,700,000. We have already appropriated \$23,430,000 and the General Services Administration cannot issue bids until the total amount required to fund the project is authorized.

The original appropriation was not sufficient due to some miscalculations made in determining the amount of dollars per square foot at the time the project was set up.

Funds were first appropriated for the hospital in 1961—it is projected to be completed near the end of 1973, 12 years later, if we appropriate this money today.

Each review of the accrediting agency, and the U.S. Office of Education through its periodic inspections, has emphasized that replacement of the existing Freedmen's Hospital structure is an essential step in maintaining accreditation of Howard's college of medicine and an acceptable quality of instruction for students in medicine and other health fields.

Construction cost have been increasing at about a rate of 1-percent a month.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SCHADEBERG

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SCHADEBERG: On page 11, between lines 2 and 3, insert the following:

“HEALTH SERVICES AND MENTAL HEALTH ADMINISTRATION HOSPITAL CONSTRUCTION

“For an additional amount for ‘Hospital Construction’, \$8,703,078, for thirty-five hospitals in Kansas, Nebraska, Oklahoma, Arkansas, New Hampshire, Maryland, North Carolina, Wisconsin, and Indiana under title III of the Public Health Service Act as follows:

“The State of Kansas, \$1,130,245:

“(1) the Saint Francis Hospital in Topeka, \$288,496.

“(2) the Saint John's Hospital in Salina, \$68,328.

“(3) the Mount Carmel Hospital in Pittsburgh, \$273,312.

“(4) the Saint Luke's Hospital in Wellington, \$129,064.

“(5) the McPherson Health Center in McPherson, \$219,349.

“(6) the Wyandotte Health Center in Kansas City, \$146,233.

“(7) the Northwest Medical Center in Goodland, \$5,463.

“The State of Nebraska, \$292,000;

“(1) the Mary Lanning Hospital in Hastings, \$140,000.

“(2) the Saint Elizabeth's Hospital in Lincoln, \$100,000.

“(3) the Madonna Nursing Home in Lincoln, \$52,000.

“The State of Oklahoma, \$3,929,275;

“(1) the Alva General Hospital in Alva, \$55,000.

“(2) the Norman Municipal Hospital in Norman, \$500,000.

“(3) the Oklahoma City-County Health Department, \$650,000.

“(4) the Hillcrest Medical Center in Tulsa, \$1,250,000.

“(5) the Newman Memorial Hospital in Shattuck, \$20,000.

“(6) the Purcell Municipal Hospital in Purcell, \$5,000.

“(7) the Okfuskee Memorial Hospital in Okema, \$30,000.

“(8) the Southwestern Memorial Hospital in Weatherford, \$255,000.

“(9) the Deaconess Hospital in Oklahoma City, \$324,275.

"(10) the Central State Hospital, Children's Unit in Norman, \$225,000.

"(11) the Arkview Memorial Hospital in El Reno, \$600,000.

"(12) the Cimarron Memorial Hospital in Boise City, \$15,000.

"The State of Arkansas, \$1,200,000:

"(1) the Saint Vincent's Hospital in Little Rock, \$200,000.

"(2) the Baptist Medical Center in Little Rock, \$1,000,000.

"The State of New Hampshire, \$2,524:

"(1) the Grafton County Nursing Home in Haverhill.

"The State of Maryland, \$59,949:

"(1) the Baltimore City Hospital, 'A' Building, in Baltimore, \$43,218.

"(2) the Dorchester County Public Health Center in Cambridge, \$16,731.

"The State of North Carolina, \$386,356:

"(1) the North Carolina Baptist Hospital in Winston-Salem.

"The State of Wisconsin, \$1,452,286:

"(1) the Saint Mary's Hospital in Wausau, \$50,000.

"(2) the Vernon Memorial Hospital in Viroqua, \$17,214.

"(3) the Saint Michael's Hospital in Stevens Point, \$33,100.

"(4) the Victory Memorial Hospital in Stanley, \$34,397.

"(5) the Beloit Memorial Hospital in Beloit, \$1,020,575.

"The State of Indiana, \$250,443:

"(1) the Saint Mary Mercy Hospital in Gary and the Union Hospital in Terre Haute."

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment on the ground that there is no authorization in law for the appropriations earmarked for these specific hospitals.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Only, Mr. Chairman, to suggest that the hospitals that are mentioned have had priority under the Hill-Burton Act and are under construction.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin, as the Chair understands it, takes the position that these funds are authorized by the Hill-Burton Act. Is that correct?

Mr. SCHADEBERG. They have had construction started under the Hill-Burton Act, yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania desire to respond to that?

Mr. FLOOD. Yes, of course, Mr. Chairman. The Hill-Burton Hospital Construction Act authorizes appropriations only to States and to territories under a very, very specific mathematical formula. There is nothing in that law at any place which authorizes appropriations for individual hospitals. As a matter of fact, the law provides that eligibility for individual hospitals shall be determined only by the States. There is no authorization either for appropriations to specific hospitals or for the U.S. Public Health Service to designate by hospital where appropriated funds are to be used.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. O'HARA). The Chair is prepared to rule on the point of order. The Chair holds that the provisions of title VI of the Public Health Service Act are as described by the gentleman from Pennsylvania. The authorizing legislation provides for appropriations on an allotment formula

to the States and does not authorize appropriations in any way for the construction of individual hospitals or permit the selection of individual hospitals for appropriation. The Chair, therefore, is constrained to sustain the point of order on the ground that the proposed amendment constitutes legislation on an appropriation bill.

(Mr. SCHADEBERG asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SCHADEBERG

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SCHADEBERG: On page 11 immediately following line 2 insert the following:

"HEALTH SERVICES AND MENTAL HEALTH ADMINISTRATION HOSPITAL CONSTRUCTION

"For an additional amount for 'Hospital Construction', \$8,703,078,

for hospitals which began construction under the Hill-Burton Act modernization category and which are under construction or have been completed before 1 January 1970.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against this proposed amendment. This is patently and clearly a case of the gentleman trying to do indirectly what he could not do directly. He is trying to evade the ruling of the Chair on the point of order just sustained by the Chair against the first amendment offered by the gentleman.

I ask that the point of order be sustained.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Chairman, my amendment does not specify specific hospitals, but only refers to hospitals that have already started construction under the Modernization Act.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, a further point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. MAHON. The amendment calls for additional actions and determinations and decisions as to hospitals which may or may not be under construction. I make that further point of order.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. O'HARA). The Chair is prepared to rule on the points of order.

The Chair finds that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin seeks to appropriate funds under the existing Hill-Burton law and formula therein without changing that law or formula, and that the additional language confining the appropriation to hospitals which are under construction or have been completed prior to January 1, 1970, would constitute a valid appropriation. The Chair therefore overrules the points of order.

The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Chairman, we are all aware of the necessity in today's inflationary economy for intelligent and realistic reductions in Federal expenditures. In committees on which I serve and at times on this floor, I have spoken against excessive Federal spending when

I felt the adverse effects of the spending far outweighed the assistance which the proposed program promised to provide.

I am not known as a big spender of taxpayers' money. On principle I do not encourage citizens to run to Washington for funds until every source of private, municipal, and State funds have been exhausted.

But the amendment I am now offering is not inconsistent with my past actions. The funds I seek by this amendment to be included in this supplemental appropriation are urgently needed by those people of nine States who have dug deep into their own pockets for money to construct needed hospitals.

Their pledges and contributions were based on the assumption that Federal funds through the Hill-Burton program would be forthcoming. Now they find that with Hill-Burton funds reduced, their hospitals in various stages of completion—and in the case of a hospital in Beloit, Wis., completed and in operation—because the contractors were willing to go along at great personal sacrifice—face serious financial consequences.

Mr. Chairman, there are 35 hospitals in nine States which started construction and which are being, or have been built, upon the promise that the funds would be forthcoming. These 35 hospitals did not receive the total amount of the Federal commitment. Last year, as a result of the reductions in funds for hospital modernization in the fiscal 1970 Health, Education, and Welfare budget, there is a deficiency of \$8.7 million which these hospitals expected to receive.

One of the hospitals is in my district. If the Beloit hospital does not receive its promised Federal commitment, the entire community will be seriously and adversely affected. Multiply the effect on this hospital by 35 and you have an indication of the importance of my amendment.

These are the facts: In 1966, in order to replace a woefully inadequate facility which could not meet the needs of 75,000 residents, the hospital board approached the State Hill-Burton agency and was granted a pledge for 40 percent of the total cost for construction. On the basis of this pledge, the community raised \$3.5 million in private donations, and sold \$5.4 million in municipal bonds. Hospital construction began in November of 1967. During the 2½ years of construction, 76 contractors and 200 workers were engaged in building a very practical and functional structure.

In October of last year the hospital board of Beloit assessed me of their problems. As a result of inadequate funding for hospital construction, they owed over \$1.5 million for construction costs. If the funds were not forthcoming from the Federal Government, liens were to be placed on the building. Expensive refinancing is the only alternative, but this approach will put the hospital in a noncompetitive position, since the increased cost would have to be borne by the patients, the very people the hospital was designed to assist.

After checking into the problem, I found that there were other hospitals in

the same situation, a situation which I believe, if not corrected, would diminish their faith in the integrity of the Federal Government; make a mockery of our efforts to be of assistance to the people of the Nation who look to us for leadership, and force the closing of a number of these 35 needed hospitals.

I do not want the people to lose faith in the integrity of their Federal Government. We must not contribute to it by reneging on our moral commitment.

Mr. Chairman, health care is one of the most important concerns of our people. It is definitely not an area in which we should retreat.

One final word—my amendment seeks funds not to add new construction on the planning boards for the future. It is for funds to meet the commitment made to communities whose hospitals had started construction and are near completion, but which have not received the amounts under previous commitments to finish what was started in good faith.

Mr. DENNEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHADEBERG. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

(Mr. DENNEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DENNEY. Mr. Chairman, I call the attention of my colleagues to the fact that what this amendment is doing is honoring a commitment that has been made throughout the United States. I have a hospital in my district which is 75 percent completed. Contractors cannot be paid, materials men cannot be paid. This is no way to run a railroad, and I think we ought to pass this amendment.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. I rise to support the amendment offered by Congressman SCHADEBERG adding funds to the Hill-Burton program.

I believe that the Federal Government has an obligation to these hospitals.

At the present time there are 35 hospitals under various phases of construction, spread throughout the Nation, which will not receive their total pledge. These are hospitals which have started construction based on financial assistance from the Federal Government. Because the Federal Government is unable to meet this need, contractors who have worked on the buildings may not be paid, and expensive means of alternative financing must be obtained.

In Nebraska's First Congressional District, an additional \$125,000 is needed by St. Elizabeth's Hospital and the Madonna Nursing Home.

At issue is the Federal obligation to finish specific programs, the dire need for which has already been determined, and upon which the building plans of the local hospital authorities have been based.

It is our hope that adequate funds will be made available for the completion of projects underway.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it is unfortunate that the gentleman proposing the amendment would even suggest that, first of all the Subcommittee on Health, Education, and

Welfare, then the full Committee on Appropriations, and this House at any time did not support in principle and with dollars this whole concept of hospital construction since the first Hill-Burton days up until the Labor-HEW bill for 1970.

May I add this: Mr. Chairman, the existing law for fiscal year 1970 is \$22.2 million above the President's budget for this very item; \$22.2 million. We went over the President's budget for these hospitals. What hospitals? For the hospitals in 50 States. It is not preferential and not parochial. Indeed not.

In addition to that, this amendment is rank discrimination against the other hospitals throughout the Nation.

May I add this: I refer you to the reputé and the record of this committee and of the House on this very appropriation. Hearings are now being conducted by the Appropriations Subcommittee for Health, Education, and Welfare, and if this supplemental bill were not on the floor, we would be taking testimony right now. These very items that the gentleman discusses today in this amendment are being considered and will be further considered in connection with the regular appropriations bill for 1971, in due course, by this subcommittee for presentation to the full committee and the House.

Mr. Chairman, this gentleman has no reason to believe that this committee will not increase these funds, none whatsoever. But if and when this is done, it should be done according to the proper procedure. There is no aspersion against the purpose. There never was. There is not now. We are already \$22.2 million above the budget for hospital construction. No preferential treatment by hospital, by district, or State has been indulged in. I cannot be for that.

Mr. Chairman, I suggest that this is an amendment to do indirectly what cannot properly be done directly in the face of the ruling of the Chair. I submit with these hearings before the committee, with a sympathetic subcommittee, and a sympathetic House there is considerable reason to believe, Mr. Chairman, that any real, legitimate hardships will be taken care of in the 1971 bill that we will have before this House within a matter of weeks.

Mr. Chairman, I urge that the amendment be defeated.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

(Mr. MICHEL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I rise very briefly in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I hate to have to oppose my good friends from Wisconsin and Nebraska who are cosponsors of this particular amendment. Mr. SCHADEBERG has been contacting all our committee members on the subject apprising us of his particular problem in Beloit. He has been very persuasive in his arguments.

However, I think it ought to be made crystal clear that there is absolutely no legal commitment or obligation on the part of the Federal Government under the Hill-Burton Act to forward fund to

the extent that these gentlemen would like to have done in their amendment.

As the chairman so well pointed out, no hearings were held on this item nor was there a budget request for this supplemental. We are currently in the process of holding extensive hearings on the entire health and welfare aspects of the regular 1971 bill. This matter will be discussed in full at that time. Of course, then having heard all of the testimony, I am sure our subcommittee will, as the chairman suggests, do the right thing and make the right kind of decision when we bring the regular bill to you.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHEL. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FLOOD. In addition, if and when, with lack of wisdom in the opinion of the gentleman who presented the amendment, the subcommittee did not act, then, certainly this amendment would be properly before this committee when that bill does come up.

Mr. MICHEL. Yes, and the gentleman's amendment would be perfectly in order and we would have a complete hearing record on which to base our decision.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SCHADEBERG).

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses, Immigration and Naturalization Service", \$892,000.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, the bleeding hearts in the editorial department of the Washington Star are sad because the Justice Department has won in a fight with the State Department and refused a visa to the widow of W. E. B. DuBois to visit this country.

The DuBoises were citizens of the United States. They became members of the Communist Party. In 1963, they threw up their U.S. citizenship, became citizens and residents of Ghana and bosom friends of dictator Kwame Nkrumah, who, although a Communist, was liberally supplied by the softheads in the State Department with millions of dollars of foreign aid. Nkrumah later fled Ghana to escape a firing squad or the gallows, but when he left he stripped the Ghanaian treasury, including all the foreign aid he could reach with his slimy fingers.

Evidently Mrs. DuBois has not been welcomed by the Ghanaian regime that succeeded the Communist thief, Nkrumah, because she picked up her luggage and moved to Cairo, Egypt.

Now, like others who have renounced their U.S. citizenship to cuddle up to the Communist comrades, the widow DuBois says she would like to see her native land once more. It is only coincidental, of course, that while having a

look she was scheduled to speak to a group of college students.

Says the Washington Star, in concluding its puerile editorial:

She might be disappointed in the spreading urban blight and the multiplication of beer cans on the landscape, but the country is strong enough to spare her a look.

Yes; this country is strong enough, but if given the chance she would probably be glad to take up residence among the beer cans, and why should this Government expend the slightest energy and expense on throwing this ingrate out of the country and returning her to Egypt?

Our compliments to Attorney General Mitchell and the Justice Department for rejecting this visa application, and a Bronx cheer for the jellyfish in the State Department who would creep and crawl to any adult American, man or woman, who willfully and willingly renounces his or her citizenship to carry the torch of communism.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield to my friend, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HALL).

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, generally I would like to associate myself with the remarks of my colleague, the gentleman from Iowa, but I wonder if the gentleman could define a little more clearly what he means by a Bronx cheer? (Pause.)

I will relieve the gentleman of that definition inasmuch as the gentleman is in the well of the House. But in all seriousness, I would like to know what the gentleman means when he said Madam DuBois "threw up" her citizenship and fled to Ghana. Does the gentleman mean threw up in the sense that one eructates, spews, or vomits forth?

Mr. GROSS. Yes, she renounced her citizenship, she threw it up.

Mr. HALL. Oh, I understand.

Does the gentleman recall numerous private bills that have come before us on the House Calendar either to cause us to allow people without citizenship to remain in the United States, or a long list of names in a bill which, if not acted on, allow the Department of Justice and/or the Attorney General to bar deportation? And does the gentleman not feel that if Madam DuBois or this "puerile" person who may be attempting to come back, and who did vomit forth and voluntarily renounce her citizenship, might become one of these "private bills" edited by some "bleeding heart" or social do-gooder, so that we would have to work our will on this House floor and keep her in the United States among the beer cans?

Mr. GROSS. I have no doubt that had she been permitted to come to this country, the Congress would have been faced, sooner or later, with a private bill to restore her citizenship.

Mr. HALL. We need another "kook" like this back in this country like we need an extra hole in the head. Let us "throw-up" a bar against her return.

Mr. GROSS. The bar is already up and I hope it stays up. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

I would point out that in this bill there is \$892,000 in additional money to the Immigration and Naturalization Service to provide for unanticipated costs of transporting, detaining, and expelling illegal aliens.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

RELATED AGENCIES

OFFICE OF EDUCATION

CIVIL RIGHTS EDUCATION

For an additional amount for "Civil Rights Education", including not to exceed \$250,000 for salaries and expenses, \$5,000,000.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I would like to explain this item with regard to the Office of Education.

(Mr. ROONEY of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I merely wish to state that I personally was in favor of the full amount requested for the item "Civil rights education, Office of Education."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

INCREASED PAY COSTS

For additional amounts for appropriations for the fiscal year 1970, for increased pay costs authorized by or pursuant to law, as follows:

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that title II relates only to increased pay costs which have been explained in previous debate, I ask unanimous that title II be considered as read—title II goes from line 11 on page 17 through line 11 on page 47—and I also ask unanimous consent that the title be open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any points of order to this particular title?

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count.

Eighty-one Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 106]

Addabbo	Foley	Ottenger
Andrews, Ala.	Ford, Gerald R.	Poage
Ashley	Fraser	Pollock
Baring	Gilbert	Price, Tex.
Bell, Calif.	Hagan	Pryor, Ark.
Berry	Harsha	Robison
Blatnik	Jarman	Roudebush
Bray	Johnson, Calif.	Schneebell
Brown, Calif.	Jones, Ala.	Sikes
Carter	Kazen	Stubblefield
Celler	Kee	Taft
Chisholm	Kirwan	Teague, Calif.
Clark	Langen	Teague, Tex.
Clawson, Del.	Lloyd	Tunney
Clay	Lujan	Waggonner
Corbett	McCarthy	Whitten
Cramer	McClory	Wiggins
Dawson	McMillan	Wilson,
de la Garza	Madden	Charles H.
Dent	Melcher	Wold
Dickinson	Meskill	Wright
Diggs	Mollohan	Yatron
Dowdy	Moorhead	Zablocki
Fallon	Murphy, Ill.	
Flowers	Murphy, N.Y.	

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair,

Mr. O'HARA, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H.R. 17399, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 357 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there amendments to title II?

If not, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE V

LIMITATION ON FISCAL YEAR 1971 BUDGET OUTLAYS

SEC. 501. (a) Expenditures and net lending (budget outlays) of the Federal Government during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, shall not exceed \$200,771,000,000: *Provided*, That whenever action, or inaction, by the Congress on requests for appropriations and other budgetary proposals varies from the President's recommendations reflected in the Budget for 1971 (H. Doc. 91-240, part 1), the Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall report to the President and to the Congress his estimate of the effect of such action or inaction on budget outlays, and the limitation set forth herein shall be correspondingly adjusted: *Provided further*, That the Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall report to the President and to the Congress his estimate of the effect on budget outlays of other actions by the Congress (whether initiated by the President or the Congress) and the limitation set forth herein shall be correspondingly adjusted, and reports, so far as practicable, shall indicate whether such other actions were initiated by the President or by the Congress.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BOLAND

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BOLAND: On page 53 on line 25 after the amount, insert the following: ", of which expenditures none shall be available for use for American ground combat forces in Cambodia."

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I know that most of the Members now in the Committee will feel that we have been here before on this amendment—and so we have, almost. But there is, I think, a difference.

If the members of this Committee will glance at the bill, they will know that the amendment I have offered pertains to title V of the bill, and that refers to expenditures for the fiscal year 1971.

I made no effort, and none of the Members on this or on the other side of the aisle have made any efforts to limit expenditures in the fiscal year 1970.

So, Mr. Chairman, this is a very clear-cut issue. All the histrionics on this matter were wrung out yesterday. I think the suggestion made by the chairman of the full Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON) that we ought to meet this issue head on now, and not freight it down with amendments to my amendment, but just vote up or down on the amendment I have offered.

What I have offered here is precisely what the President of the United States says he wants to happen. He indicated that it was his desire, his hope and ac-

tually his command, when he met with the members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of both Houses, and the Senate and House Armed Services Committees, that American combat ground troops would be out of Cambodia in 6 to 8 weeks.

So he still has that opportunity to fulfill that promise to the American people, to the Congress, and to the committees of Congress. This amendment does not restrict that desire.

The amendment that I have offered deals solely and only with expenditures in fiscal 1971. Someone asked me, when I offered this amendment a moment ago, "Why offer this amendment now?" Because I believe that this is one vehicle and one way in which the Congress itself can assert its own prerogatives and its own power in a matter that directly concerns this Nation in a very vital way. This is an appropriation bill. This is a proper place for this kind of an amendment; this amendment pending the expenditure of funds in fiscal year 1971. It prohibits expenditures in fiscal year 1971 for American combat proposed troops in Cambodia.

As a matter of fact, in the Defense Department appropriation bill of 1970 there was a similar amendment which was offered in the other body which ask accepted in conference and by this House. It related to the countries of Laos and Thailand.

This amendment relates solely to the country of Cambodia, the area that is now giving this Nation so much frustration, so much anxiety, and so much pain. This is one way to help alleviate, in my judgment, some of the pain, some of the frustration, and some of the anxiety that is now developing all over this land.

We are not touching the funds for 1970, only 1971. Over the past year, over the past couple of years, not alone in this administration, but the past administration, we have been told that we can build up the forces in South Vietnam and that ARVN with its own troops and the great amount of equipment the United States has supplied to them to take care of the situation in South Vietnam.

Let me say that with the standing army the South Vietnamese now have, and with immense amount of equipment and materiel that we now have sent them, if they are not now able to defend their own areas in Saigon from some of the sanctuaries that were in Cambodia, they never will be able to do it. We have gone in, I believe the present campaign has met with some degree of success, in cleaning out the sanctuaries of some hospital supplies, food supplies, munitions and huts. But before long the North Vietnamese will be back in the sanctuaries.

It would seem to me that the obligation now is upon the ARVN, the South Vietnamese Army, to defend its own positions if they are attacked from the sanctuaries. Let the ARVN troops go in and clean out the sanctuaries. We have done our part, as we are now doing, and which the President thinks will be a success. All of us pray it will be a success.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLAND. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. In fact, the President himself said that the incursion into Cambodia was for the purpose of advancing his policy of Vietnamization. I do not know that it will, but that is his judgment and this amendment will give him the time he has said he will need.

Mr. BOLAND. Let me tell the Members of the Committee that this is the proper vehicle for this kind of amendment. I think all of us should join—Republicans ought to join with Democrats—in adopting this amendment and let the country know that the Congress does have a voice and does have a power in these matters. It most assuredly has an obligation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the amendment and all amendments thereto conclude at 4 o'clock.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

GENERAL DEBATE

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may revise and extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Chairman, I am gravely concerned about the President's decision to send American troops into Cambodia, a nation which heretofore has been adamant in her declarations of international neutrality.

I am not privileged to know what information led the President to order this action. I must, of necessity, therefore assume the President is doing what he believes is best for the Nation. However, I am unequivocally opposed to any future expansion of this conflict, or this Nation's participation in any conflict, until such time as the Congress is given all the whys and wherefores.

I question the reasoning for using our troops in Cambodia on the grounds that that country is a sanctuary for the Vietcong and North Vietnamese forces. This has been common knowledge for years. What I cannot understand is why the President will use American soldiers to invade this sanctuary when our forces are prevented from invading the principal stronghold of the enemy—North Vietnam.

Nonetheless, our troops are in Cambodia and there are predictions they will be out in 6 weeks or so. I wonder. I can recall a prediction made during the Korean conflict that American troops would be home before Christmas of a particular year. However, Red China entered the fray and Christmas was a long time coming.

I want no more Koreas, Vietnams, Cambodias or any other undeclared war started at the discretion of any President. I believe the authority to plunge this Nation into bloody battle should rest where it was placed by the Constitution—in the hands of the Congress.

I hope and pray this latest maneuver ordered by our Chief Executive does not lead to similar involvement in Laos, Thailand, Burma, or anywhere else in Southeast Asia where the threat of enemy activity is part of the everyday life.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND). The House of Representatives finds itself today in a position where it can by its action lower the level of tension which has been built up and which has reflected itself so tragically throughout our country as a result of the invasion of Cambodia by U.S. troops. The Congress does have a constitutional responsibility which it can assert by supporting the Boland amendment—but it can also show that it is sensitive to the emotion that is engulfing our young people because they did believe that President Nixon meant to withdraw from Vietnam—and are dismayed by his actions which now includes Cambodia in that tragic course.

The decision of the President to permit hot pursuit, or what he justifies as hot pursuit, into the nation of Cambodia, is to be deplored and condemned. It is based on military intelligence indicating that geographically this nation harbored threats to the American troops in Vietnam and that the elimination of these threats would somehow speed American troop withdrawal. No one could have greater awareness than I of the potential and the uncertainties of combat intelligence. At any rate the results of the Cambodian invasion as they have been reported do not appear to have warranted any enlargement of our combat activities into Cambodia. They certainly do not support the tragic domestic consequences which have followed in the wake of our expansion of the war in Southeast Asia.

An administration which came into power on the slogan of "Bring Us Together," seems to be trying to drive us apart. The lamentable confrontation—and the tragic deaths—at Kent State University reflect rising national tension as the administration reacts unwisely to increasing dissent to its policies. I find that nothing can be said to defend the policies of an Ohio State administration which authorizes live ammunition and deadly force to control student demonstrations. A full-scale investigation of this tragedy must now be held.

We in the Congress can be most helpful in this greater effort if we support Representative BOLAND's amendment for it does not interfere with the President's present actions in Cambodia, but it will prevent further involvement in that area after July 1 without the approval and consent of the Congress.

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND).

The recent decision of the President to extend the war in Vietnam to the neighboring nation of Cambodia constitutes, in spite of what the President has stated, a grave escalation of the war as well as a constitutional crisis.

The President failed to consult with either the Senate which has direct

constitutional authority to "advise and consent" in matters of major foreign policy, or the House which holds the powers of the purse in all matters concerning Federal spending, including foreign and military assistance. The failure to formally consult with either House or, informally with any Members of the Congress, constitutes a grave slap at the only branch of Government most responsive to the changing attitudes of the people.

This failure of the President is not only an insult to Members of Congress and their constituents, but evinces an intention on the part of the President to assume greater powers than given him by the Constitution. Never before, has a President invaded another country without first consulting with Congress.

Furthermore, the President indicated that the reason for sending troops to Cambodia, an independent sovereign country, was that it was necessary to destroy the North Vietnamese headquarters operation as well as other enemy installations and materiel.

At this time the Cambodian operation has been a military failure as I shall point out.

In the past few days since the invasion, I have received hundreds of letters from constituents in Hudson County deploring the President's action. When I left my office, letters, telegrams, and phone calls were still coming in. Some were from people who had never before written to me. Some constituents were so enraged they called for the impeachment of the President.

The President has created a situation bordering on hysteria among many people who believed that he meant to deescalate and end the war, not create a new and larger one.

I am appalled by this unilateral decision to substantially enlarge and materially change the scope of what I always believed has been limited to a war in Vietnam. The President's decision runs the risk of a major conflagration involving all of Southeast Asia and China.

The President previously stated in his campaign that he advocated the deescalation of the war at an early date. It was largely upon that promise that he was elected. However, this new military adventure into Cambodia is not in fact a deescalation of the war in Vietnam, nor can it lead to its termination. Together with other recent acknowledgments of our unauthorized activity in Laos and Thailand, it is an ill-considered escalation and the possible beginning of a new war in Southeast Asia which could involve over a million men in a guerrilla war. I am opposed to this escalation in Southeast Asia.

On April 20, President Nixon promised to deescalate by withdrawing 150,000 men from Vietnam by the end of 1970.

On April 23, Secretary of State Rogers told a House Appropriations Subcommittee that the administration had "no incentive to escalate. Our whole incentive is to deescalate," said the Secretary.

He continued:

We realize that if we escalate and get involved in Cambodia with our ground troops that our whole (Vietnamization) program is defeated.

Moreover, the Secretary specifically stated that the administration would want to consult fully with the Congress because the administration recognized the need for public support.

It would seem obvious that in order to support our men in Cambodia, we would require the continued presence of at least the 150,000 men the President indicated would be withdrawn. Thus, this administration has created the greatest credibility gap of all.

The President indicated that the purpose of this invasion was to destroy enemy headquarters, military materiel and communications. As of this date no such headquarters have been found to exist, no major documents have been turned up, no important officers captured—the military materiel seized can be quickly and easily replaced.

The definition of success of this invasion has, therefore, intentionally been revised downward by the President. I understand that the "new definition of success" will involve military supplies and pounds of rice captured and installations destroyed. All can be quickly replaced or rebuilt within a short time.

Moreover, the military invasion ordered by the President, as recognized by the Secretary of State, so changed the character of our involvement in Southeast Asia that he was constitutionally bound to consult with and obtain the approval of the Congress before taking military action in Cambodia.

The Constitution specifically provides that the power to declare war and determine its strategic course rests with Congress.

The Founding Fathers were explicit in this regard. They were unwilling to bestow upon one man both the power to declare and the power to conduct a war.

I do not wish to obstruct the President in his duty as commander in chief, but neither will I, as a representative of the people who elected me, accede to the President powers conferred upon me by the Constitution and which the people of Hudson County expect me to exercise in their behalf.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FINDLEY).

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FINDLEY TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BOLAND

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND).

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FINDLEY to the amendment offered by Mr. BOLAND: In front of the period insert the following: "except those which protect the lives of American troops remaining within South Vietnam."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. MAHON. I make a point of order on the ground that the amendment requires particular and special duties.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, I feel that it does not impose any specific

duties. No report is required. No determination is required. It applies simply to troops that are there for a specific purpose.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I make the further point of order that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. O'HARA). The Chair has examined the proposed amendment to the amendment. In the opinion of the Chair the proposed amendment to the amendment constitutes an exception to the limitation that was offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts, does not constitute additional legislation, and is germane. Therefore the Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk read the Boland amendment as it would be amended by my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Boland amendment as it would be amended by the Findley amendment as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BOLAND of Massachusetts as amended by the Findley amendment: On page 53 on line 25 after the amount, insert the following: ", of which expenditures none shall be available for use for American ground combat forces in Cambodia except those which protect the lives of American troops remaining within South Vietnam."

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, I would hope that no Member of this body would wish to leave the impression, by supporting any amendment today, that subsequent to July 1 he would wish the President of the United States as Commander in Chief to fail to do what he feels is necessary to protect the lives of American troops remaining in South Vietnam.

That is why I propose this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FINDLEY) to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND).

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FINDLEY) there were—ayes 50, noes 87.

So the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. RIEGLE).

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Chairman, as I understand the Boland amendment it would give the President some 7 weeks to conclude American military operations in Cambodia. I believe this is reasonable, and hence I support the Boland amendment. I believe that beyond that time, if the President feels the strategic interests of this country are really on the line, he should then do exactly what the Constitution requires; that is, come before this body and seek formal congressional authorization to proceed beyond that point.

The other day in our subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee we had as a witness the AID Director from Vietnam. He made the comment to me that his wife had been with him in Saigon for the past 10 months, and had just come

back to Washington, D.C., and he said she actually feels safer on the streets of Saigon than she does on the streets of Washington, D.C., our Nation's Capital.

What a sad admission this is, that we should devote so much effort and attention to Southeast Asia that we should actually make the streets of Saigon safer than those of our Nation's Capital, or Detroit, or Los Angeles, or of any other major city in this country.

I believe that in supporting the Boland amendment we have an opportunity to regain our proper constitutional authority in the formulation of national policy.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman I rise in support of the amendment by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND) to prevent the expenditure of the funds under this act after July 1, 1970, for ground combat operations in Cambodia. The President has said that our Cambodian adventure is no open-ended arrangement. All this amendment seeks to do is to guarantee that fact.

The President has said that we will be out in 6 weeks. This amendment takes him at his word. It gives him the time he asks for and no more. I believe that is a reasonable compromise and it deserves the support of this House.

(Mr. OBEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. RHODES).

(Mr. RHODES asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Chairman, let there be no doubt about this. The North Vietnamese troops who are in Cambodia, are just as much a part of the war in South Vietnam as if they were stationed there permanently. They fight in South Vietnam and kill Americans there. They should be hit.

If these bases are not hit they will become the nucleus of a Communist supply and operations bastion which will seriously threaten the diminished American forces remaining behind after the next 150,000 increment is withdrawn.

There are many fine young Americans in Washington today protesting the action in Cambodia. I defend their right to do this, though I disagree with them thoroughly.

I sincerely hope that none of them will ever have to serve in Vietnam. If they do, I hope they will not be among those left after the next 150,000 Americans are pulled out. If they are a part of that diminished force, I hope they will not be threatened and perhaps overrun by troops operating from privileged sanctuaries in Cambodia. If this should occur, I am sure that each such person would regret the success of the effort in which he, and Members of this body, are engaged today.

The facts are that any American soldiers who is in that diminished force, if these privileged sanctuaries are allowed to remain, will be in very grave danger. That is the precise reason the President

made this difficult decision—to protect American lives—American soldiers who may, in the future, serve in Vietnam.

I say we should defeat this amendment, because if we keep saying to the North Vietnamese that you should come on back after we blow up these sanctuaries and make more sanctuaries and say to the American Government that you cannot go in and destroy them, it is no way to protect American lives.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES).

Mr. YATES. The gentleman from Arizona, my very good friend, premises his argument on the fact that there should be a permanent force of North Vietnamese in Cambodia and says therefore we ought to allow a permanent force of American troops in Cambodia or else permit them to come back at some time in the future if they are needed.

Mr. RHODES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I will not yield.

Mr. RHODES. The gentleman is putting words in my mouth that I did not say.

Mr. YATES. I decline to yield. Let me finish my statement.

The President of the United States himself has said that he is going to stay in Cambodia for 6 to 8 weeks. We have taken him at his word by this amendment. The gentleman from Massachusetts proposes a limitation of funds for the appropriations beginning July 1, 1970, and to continue through the next fiscal year. The President would be permitted to have American troops in Cambodia to carry on their duties until June 30, 1970.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Boland amendment. I am opposed to President Nixon's decision to send American troops into Cambodia. The gentleman's amendment would limit the Cambodian expedition to June 30, 1970; it would permit the President the 6 to 8 weeks he said he would need for his purposes there.

Mr. Chairman, together with the country, I was shocked by President Nixon's decision to invade Cambodia. I thought it was an unfortunate reversal of the winding-down policy that we had been led to believe that the President was promulgating and that we were on our way to bring our troops out of Vietnam. His announcement that he had ordered the withdrawal of 150,000 American troops was accepted as being in line with this policy and then suddenly without consulting the Congress, instead of winding down the war, the President escalated it by sending American boys into Cambodia.

I consider the President's action to be ill-considered, an action that will factionalize the country to an even greater degree than it is now and will loose explosive forces. It will exacerbate tensions that were quiescent. One has only to look at the press to see that every university campus in the country has been stirred into reaction against his decision.

Mr. Chairman, earlier today, I was visited by a young man who lives in my district, Peter Temple, who attends Haverford College. I was impressed by the young man. He said that the students at

Haverford College were determined not to resort to violence, but they had to have some vehicle or path to follow to indicate their profound opposition to the President's decision. The whole college, all the students and the faculty, have decided to come to Washington today to speak to their Congressmen quietly, earnestly, to let them know their views in opposition to what the President has done. Peter gave me a statement of purpose issued by John R. Coleman, president of Haverford College; Thomas L. Gowen, president of the student council, and Stanley J. Murphy, past president of the student council. They announced their purpose as being "to express to our representatives the full depth of our concern for what the Cambodian crisis is doing to American life, and to learn from them what we can about that crisis."

They added:

We take this unusual step of moving almost the entire College to Washington because we see no other way to respond rationally and creatively to this crisis. We have already seen the frightening consequences from the enlargement of the war in Southeast Asia. We have seen much of the educational process undermined in this past week as doubts, fear, and bitterness take over on campus after campus. We reject the thought that it is "bums" who fail to see the logic in widening a war in order to narrow it. We assert that it is thoughtful men everywhere that are troubled by the path now being pursued in Vietnam and Cambodia.

We come to Washington, as members of an educational community, to speak out and to learn. We do not pretend to have any easy answers on which we unite. But we are united in our determination to act with courage, sense, and taste in expressing fear about what is now going on and hope about what Congress can do to save us from further calamity in Asia and further division at home.

Mr. Chairman, we must give the young men and women of this country the opportunity to express themselves and to know that their duly elected representatives are listening to them. This resolution offers that opportunity.

The day will come, Mr. Chairman, when the Executive will consult the Congress before taking the country into war, when Congress will insist upon it as we seek to do today in measure by the Boland amendment. The President should have done so in this instance before he ordered American boys to Cambodia. The constitutional provisions are clear. We cannot abide unilateral action of this kind by any President.

The gentleman from Arizona (Mr. RHODES) has stated that North Vietnam has stationed a permanent force in Cambodia. He argues, therefore, that the President should be able to move into Cambodia at will to battle that force as frequently as he wishes to do so. Such an argument gives substance to the fear that many Americans have that Cambodia has become a permanent battleground of the widened war, that if the President feels justified in moving our Armed Forces across boundaries of nations without the approval of Congress, he can do so if he deems it advantageous to advance our position in the war. Such an argument assumes the rightness of invading Cambodia not once, but as often

as he desires to carry the war into Thailand or into such other countries as he deems necessary to support our goals in that war, all this without congressional approval. Such a thesis violates the Constitution and places too much power in the hands of the President. I am opposed to the doctrine of "the moving sanctuary," of attacking sanctuaries no matter where they may be.

I believe we ought to end the Cambodian invasion as quickly as possible and bring an end to this new Nixon doctrine. I will support the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts to limit our intervention.

Mr. Chairman, I discussed the situation in my recent newsletter to my constituents in which I said:

President Abraham Lincoln told the story of his friend from Illinois who was a member of a group of visitors to the state penitentiary. After the group had viewed the entire institution and was preparing to leave, Lincoln's friend became separated and suddenly found himself alone and lost. Finally, after wandering through the corridors for a while, in desperation he turned to a convict who was looking out from between the bars of his cell door and cried: "Say, how do you get out of this place?"

We have been trying for a long time to get out of the war in Vietnam but without success. In 1965 when large contingents of American troops were sent to Vietnam, briefings were initiated by the President for members of Congress at which "experts" from the Department of State and the Department of Defense would advise us on what was happening in the war. When we inquired, as we invariably did, how long they thought the war would last and whether there was any possibility of reaching an agreement with the other side of a ceasefire, the answer given was that there was no telling how long the war would last, that it would end not by any agreement but by the enemy "just fading away" after having encountered the massive power of our armed forces.

The war, of course, has not faded away and it does not appear likely to do so in the near future. Rather than disappearing, it has suddenly taken new force and shape with major fighting in Laos and Cambodia.

It was against this background that President Nixon made his statement on Vietnam last week, a statement that left many questions unanswered. Although he said nothing in so many words about the United States moving into Cambodia, his subsequent approval of sending captured communist weapons to the Cambodians, followed by Secretary of State Rogers' condemnation of the outbreak of fighting as "an invasion" would seem to indicate the President is flirting with intervention, an act which I believe would be disastrous and would escalate the war. I have written to President Nixon voicing my strong objection to any such participation on our part.

In his statement President Nixon reaffirmed his policy of Vietnamization which is supposed eventually to shift the entire burden of carrying on the war to the forces of South Vietnam without the continued assistance of American troops. But it is such a long process. Even with the withdrawal of 150,000 Americans under the President's order over the next 13 months, at this time next year there will still be 250,000 American boys in service in Vietnam, many of whom will lose their lives as the war goes on. If peace is to come, it must come through agreement rather than Vietnamization.

Although the Paris conference is presently at an impasse and although the President's statement discounted the chances for any

fruitful discussions in this forum, I found some hope in the passage from his statement which read:

"A fair political solution should reflect the existing relationship of political forces within South Vietnam. We recognize the complexity of shaping machinery that would fairly apportion political power in South Vietnam. We're flexible. We have offered nothing on a take it or leave it basis."

If this passage means what it seems to say, it opens a whole new negotiating front because it indicates the President is not firmly and inexorably tied to the Thieu-Ky government. In my letter I urged him to reactivate the Paris negotiations with the appointment of a new ambassador of highest rank to represent us. I liked his use of the word "flexible." Flexibility on both sides can point the road to peace.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. KOCH).

(Mr. KOCH asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Chairman, every day that we are in Cambodia violates our Constitution. I support the Boland amendment as the best that can come through this House, but I think we ought to be out today.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. LANDGREBE).

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Chairman, the sacred sanctuaries in Cambodia have cost the lives of unknown thousands of our finest young men. I was within 4 miles of that border last year myself. The commander of our post in this small town that I was in had lost his life because of the shelling from the safety behind the borders. These men are there and they are our finest young men. They are willing to die to protect the freedom of the South Vietnamese, the freedom of America, and the free world. Those sanctuaries should have been destroyed years ago. I do not think that Congress in this bill should be placing limitations on the actions of our President in his effort to not only protect the lives of our boys who are in South Vietnam nor this country's efforts to win military victory over the Communists in Southeast Asia.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. FARBSTEN).

Mr. FARBSTEN. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to keep our soldiers out of Cambodia after June 30, and I am all for it. We continue to divide our people and permit the fomenting of a condition that can only injure our Nation. The President said we shall only go 21 miles into Cambodia. This explodes the sanctuary theory, because beyond that area there will remain a permanent sanctuary. Hence what is the point to be gained? Let us get them out. Let us get them out as soon as we can, and if we can get them out by June 30, we will save so many more lives. Let us give the President the opportunity to carry out his pledge and pass the amendment.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FARBSTEN. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

(Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia

asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I support the Boland amendment because I believe we never should have gone into Vietnam or Cambodia, and should withdraw from both areas as quickly as possible. I have sent the following telegram to the Secretary of the Interior, the Honorable Walter Hickel, which I would like to read. I emphasize that I am categorically opposed to violence, whether on the campuses, on the streets, or in Southeast Asia. Those misguided students and radicals who resort to rock-throwing, bottle-throwing, bomb-throwing and other forms of violence, including the burning of buildings, are inviting counterviolence and I deplore and denounce these tactics. By the adoption of the Boland amendment and a quick exit from both Cambodia and Vietnam, we can take positive steps toward peace in the world and tranquility at home. Now I would like to read the telegram which I sent to say to the Secretary of the Interior:

MAY 7, 1970.

HON. WALTER HICKEL,
Secretary of Interior,
Washington, D.C.:

Heartiest congratulations to you on your courageous letter to the President. It has been a sad week in American history, and developments in Cambodia and on the college campuses have left millions of Americans confused, frustrated and disillusioned. The fact that a member of the President's cabinet has the courage to speak out in the frank terms lends new faith to those who are deeply concerned about the future of our nation. I trust that statements like yours can be accompanied by a spirit of cooperation, communication and better understanding between high Government leaders and all the people of this nation. Words alone cannot unite this nation, yet words have been misused to accentuate divisions among our people. Millions of determined Americans are anxious to reverse this war madness and once again place the priority where it belongs—on the life and dignity of human beings, and their ability to live and breathe in a healthy environment. As one whose official responsibilities extend to our environment, I once again congratulate you for your leadership and urge you not to retreat in your determination to hold to the views expressed in your letter to the President.

Congressman KEN HECHLER.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. DENNIS).

(Mr. DENNIS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DENNIS. Mr. Chairman, what will be absolutely essential and necessary to our interest and our safety months from now, no one here today knows, or can know. Yet here on this floor this afternoon, acting under political pressure, and some of us seeking to make political headlines, we are asked, as to this particular President, to circumscribe the powers of the President of the United States, powers which he has exercised as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces since the very earliest days of the Republic. It is an ill-considered thing, Mr. Chairman, which we ought not to do.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD).

(Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Boland amendment because it is the only opportunity we will have to express ourselves on the question of whether or not we approve of sending American troops into Cambodia. We tried to get a clear expression on this issue yesterday and failed. We were not consulted by the President before the fact was accomplished. We now are doing the very best we can with this amendment to express our appeal to the President not to further broaden the war and our involvement in Indochina.

I suggest to the gentleman from Arizona and others who are so deeply concerned about what our actions here may say to the North Vietnamese that they pay a little bit more attention to what our actions here today are saying to the young people of this country. They are looking to us with the question on their lips, "Can the political system of this country deal within the framework of our Constitution with the most serious question dividing this country today?"

Mr. Chairman, if we leave here today as we did yesterday demonstrating the fact that we are incapable of even taking the President at his word and preventing further expansion of the war we will be saying to every young person in the country that the Government of this country and its institutions are impotent and incapable of dealing with this serious and direct threat to the very foundations of our Nation.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from California.

(Mr. COHELAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to compliment the gentleman from Michigan and to associate myself with his remarks.

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. I yield to the gentleman.

(Mr. BRASCO asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Boland amendment and suggest that the way to cure the dilemma that this House faces is to take positive action on the Boland amendment today.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GIAIMO).

(Mr. GIAIMO asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND).

Our policy in Southeast Asia is bankrupt and very clearly is flying in the face of the realities which exist in that area of the world.

We have spent billions and billions of dollars, we have sent hundreds of thousands of troops, we have assisted the South Vietnamese in their efforts to Vietnamize the war and still the war drags on and on and on interminably.

Mr. Chairman, I am convinced, as I am certain are many of the American people, that we must act favorably on this amendment to demonstrate Congress' determination to deescalate the war and to reduce the American position in that struggle. Our entry into Cambodia flies in the face of that policy.

Mr. Chairman, in my opinion this is a very positive manner in which the Congress can assert its prerogatives and show its leadership in trying to reduce the American effort in Southeast Asia.

Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND).

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. WALDIE).

(Mr. WALDIE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Chairman, the invasion of Cambodia seems to me to be an incredible admission by the administration of the failure of the President's highly touted Vietnamization policy. If 1.2 million South Vietnamese under arms cannot defend the leisurely withdrawal over a period of several years of 200,000 American troops from that country, unless the enemy is entirely destroyed by American troops, then Vietnamization means the South Vietnamese will be able to stand alone in South Vietnam only when the American Armed Forces have destroyed the enemy. That was the policy of the prior administration.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot think of a worse policy for this country to engage in and of a worse action than that which the President engaged in last week.

The President should take his eyes off the jungles of Cambodia for a moment and look at his own country. His concentration with the glamor of military strategy has prevented him from noting that his policies are causing convulsions of violence and dissent in this country. Whatever temporary military advantage might be gained by expanding this war will seem of no consequence if American society erupts into violence and chaos as a result. That tragedy is not remote but is real and present.

Lyddell-Hart, the great western military strategist, laid down a basic limitation on all military tactics. No matter how wise and effective a proposed military tactic might seem its effectiveness is limited by the adage, "He who pays the piper, calls the tune."

Mr. President, the youth of this Nation, the mothers and fathers, the wives and sweethearts, those who "pay the piper" of your dangerous attachment to military solutions in Vietnam, are sick, disillusioned, angry and lack confidence in you and this administration. They are now "calling the tune," Mr. President, and the lyrics of that tune are simple and strong—"end that war and do it now and not by expanding it."

Mr. LOWENSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALDIE. I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. LOWENSTEIN).

(Mr. LOWENSTEIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LOWENSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, I want to associate myself with the remarks that were made by the gentleman from California, and to ask how we are going to Vietnamize the war in Vietnam by Americanizing the war in Cambodia?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE).

(Mr. CONTE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to take much time because we discussed this at great length yesterday. The issue now is the same as it was when we debated the Leggett amendment—it is whether this body is going to assert itself on the question of Cambodia.

As the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND) has said, his amendment is substantially similar to the amendment adopted by the House last year. It was then known as the Church amendment, and it provided that no expenditures shall be available for American ground combat forces in Laos and Thailand. The amendment offered now by Mr. BOLAND would merely add Cambodia to that list.

This is a very mild amendment. It does not hinder what President Nixon proposes to do because it does not go into effect until July 1. It does not endanger any of our troops. Therefore, I think the House should assert its authority and approve this amendment.

I supported the Leggett amendment and I now support the Boland amendment because I think we in this body must speak up—and speak up loudly and clearly—to the people of this great Nation. They are looking to the Congress for guidance at this critical period, and I think we must respond—now.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. THOMPSON).

(Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, we are in the debt of our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND) for offering this absolutely reasonable and sensible amendment. The time has come, notwithstanding all the rhetoric to the contrary, for this body to exercise our responsibility in this regard. It is a reasonable, thoughtful, and constructive amendment, and I associate myself with the statements of those who support the amendment. Actually it is, in essence, one more opportunity for us to express our opposition to the war in Vietnam and Cambodia. We shall continue such efforts until we have the victory which Mr. BOLAND's amendment deserves.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. Moss.)

(Mr. MOSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Massachusetts has afforded us an appropriate opportunity to speak out responsibly here in Congress—and if you need evidence that we need to speak out, then read the ticker tapes out in the Speaker's lobby, and you will find that the Nation has a great number of its colleges and universities closed at this moment.

We find that the Commanding Officer of the National Guard Bureau has authorized the use of National Guard personnel as night watchmen around this Nation. It reads almost like a war communique here in this Nation, and that has been brought about primarily because of the very unwise action taken by the President in acting without the sanction of the Congress.

Mr. Chairman, I think the very least we can do is to take him at his word and give him his 8 weeks, and cut off the funds for fiscal 1971.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ARENDS).

(Mr. ARENDS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, we covered this ground at great length on yesterday. Now we are preparing to do it over again. May I simply say that I for one do not intend to tie the hands of the President in any way in this matter, none whatsoever, because he is my President as well as yours, and what we should do is support the President of the United States in this case whether you agree with him politically or not.

I have here two news releases which have just come out which indicate in very clear fashion that progress is being made, in Cambodia. At the moment it appears we are on the road toward doing what the President and the country had hoped we would be able to do.

As of this very moment we have captured almost—almost—1 million total rounds of ammunition. This means 1 million less rounds of ammunition that are going to be shot at our American boys just across the Cambodian border in South Vietnam.

Likewise I have a Reuters dispatch which has just come in over the wire, and it says:

An Allied force today claimed it captured the Viet Cong headquarters, which was the target of the invasion of Cambodia.

Mr. Chairman, this proves that we are moving in the direction we had hoped to move, and I would trust that Congress would do nothing at this particular time to slow down what appears to be real progress in our efforts to destroy the sanctuaries in Cambodia.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. BINGHAM).

(Mr. BINGHAM asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, at the

meeting Tuesday President Nixon told the members of the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and I quote:

We expect the Soviets to protest our action (in Cambodia) just as we protested their invasion of Czechoslovakia.

That is quite an equation. I am not suggesting that Mr. Nixon regards the two actions as comparable, but I am suggesting that when he made his decision on Cambodia, President Nixon seems to have forgotten the precept of our Founding Fathers that we should show a decent respect for the opinions of mankind—and the opinions of mankind include the opinions of young Americans as well as the opinions of people around the world.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the adoption of the Boland amendment would go some way to repair the damage that has been done.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOWARD).

(Mr. HOWARD asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, I am sure we are all very happy to hear the report a few minutes ago from the distinguished minority whip, who stated, as the President had indicated, that the objectives are being met and that we are destroying the enemy's capability of killing American men in South Vietnam.

I think that since the President said we would be out of there by July 1, and since this amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts does not take effect until after July 1, that we should all give the President a vote of confidence by supporting this amendment, and then we can all go home very happy this afternoon.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. LEGGETT).

(Mr. LEGGETT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Chairman, I was alarmed on reading the newspapers just a few minutes ago, one of the late releases that came out, that I understand really violates the President's pledge to the members of the House Committee on Armed Services and the Senate committee that American ground forces would penetrate no more than 20 miles or 30 miles into Cambodia. I understand now the U.S. Navy is now floating up the Mekong River all the way to Phnom Penh.

I say that we ought to save the President from some of the wild desires of some of the military leaders.

He said in response to my questions down at the White House the other day—I said, "Do you need American ground forces in Cambodia in the next fiscal year?" He said, "Congressman, I want to assure you that I will have the 'head' (that is a paraphrase)—of the Chairman of my Joint Chiefs of Staff if we have them there after July 1."

So I say the amendment of Mr. BOLAND is directly in point and should be supported.

As to the arguments that have been made that this is a partisan effort, I remind again the distinguished minority whip that GERRY FORD, 2 years ago said the following to President Johnson on hot pursuit in Cambodia.

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 10, 1968]

CONSULT HILL ON "HOT PURSUIT," FORD ASKS

House Republican Leader Gerald R. Ford called on President Johnson yesterday to clear with Congress before committing U.S. troops to any "hot pursuit" of Communist troops across the Cambodian border from Vietnam.

"Personally I feel they have not made a case for hot pursuit," he told a news conference in commenting on current Administration efforts to bar use of Cambodia as a Communist sanctuary in the war.

"It is important that they [the Administration] come to Congress, present the problem, and get our concurrence before they adopt a new policy of hot pursuit. This would be a drastic change," he said.

Ford said he believes North Vietnam is displaying a "change of attitude" that could lead to negotiations and an end to the war, but he warned against any cessation of U.S. bombing until Hanoi also scales down the conflict. At a minimum, he said, North Vietnam should halve the flow of manpower and supplies across its border into South Vietnam.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. LOWENSTEIN).

Mr. LOWENSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, one element of this discussion that disturbs me is the repeated suggestion that somehow those of us who are concerned about the effect on young people in this country of the unauthorized extension of the war are less interested in the effect of the extension of the war on the young men who are in Vietnam. That suggestion is insulting to the intelligence of those who make it. It implies that they do not understand that bringing home soldiers involved in pointless wars is in fact the best way to diminish the risks borne by those soldiers.

The point of course is that passing this amendment will help all the young people of this country, the young people here and the young people in Vietnam as well—and the not so young people too. It will help the United States, because it can help to spare us further bitterness, and to save lots of money. It can increase faith in the constitutional processes of this country at a time when that would add measurably to our national security. Above all, it will save a great many lives that need not be lost.

It may even help to save us from ever undergoing again the horror of young Americans in uniform shooting other young Americans on a sunny field on a pleasant campus near the heart of this country.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LOWENSTEIN. I yield to the gentleman.

(Mr. RYAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, today the House has an opportunity to rectify the errors of yesterday, when debate on the issue of Cambodia was cut off, and when

the House failed to pass any amendments to the military procurement bill, H.R. 17123, expressing opposition to the President's unilateral, unauthorized action in sending American ground combat troops into Cambodia. It is 1 week since President Nixon's announcement that American troops had been ordered into Cambodia, and today, the press reports that 20,000 American troops are in that country.

The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND) has offered an amendment to H.R. 17399, the second supplemental appropriation bill for fiscal year 1970, barring any utilization of fiscal year 1970 funds for American troops in Cambodia.

It is essential that Congress exercise the power of the purse to curb the administration's appetite for military answers to the political problem of Vietnam.

The amendment is entirely in line with the similar provision adopted last December 15 by the Senate, and agreed to by the House accepting the conference report on December 18, 1969, which is section 643 of the Department of Defense Appropriation Act, Public Law 91-171, for fiscal year 1970. It reads:

SEC. 643. In line with the expressed intention of the President of the United States, none of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be used to finance the introduction of American ground troops in Laos or Thailand.

Today we seek to expand the import of this provision to include coverage of Cambodia. It is really not even an expansion of the previously enacted legislation embodied in the Defense Department appropriation bill, but the filling in of a gap unintentionally left by the Senate and House last December. At that time, details of the secret war in Laos and the administration's commitments in Thailand were beginning to come to light. The language then passed was an expression of congressional determination that American ground combat troops would not be used outside of Vietnam. At that time, no one even considered that the President might take the unthought-of action of invading the neutral nation of Cambodia. Had the thought occurred, clearly section 643 would have covered this possibility also. The Senate debate makes this conclusion clear, for the concern of the Senate—a concern which the House must be presumed to have shared in accepting the Senate-passed amendment—was expansion of the war in Southeast Asia.

But, the past aside, the matter of major concern now is that American ground combat troops are in Cambodia. No semantic doubletalk is available to the Pentagon, which has chosen in the past to define "ground combat troops" as excluding "advisers." Here the situation is starkly clear, and clearly extreme.

This amendment would deprive the President of the funds to conduct his new war in Cambodia. It offers the House an opportunity to assert its constitutional responsibility on the question of war and peace. There was a sound reason why the Constitution states that no appropriation of money for raising and supporting an army shall be for a longer term than 2 years. It was so that the people through their elected representatives would be able to exercise control over the military. Let us do so now.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Bow).

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the Boland amendment. I believe this would tie the hands of the President of the United States.

This war in Cambodia started 4 years ago when the Communists from North Vietnam invaded Cambodia and built their sanctuaries along the Cambodian boundary line. These sanctuaries are what we are going to destroy.

Now let us face the fact that we are being successful. But what you say is that we can be successful only once. You are saying the North Vietnamese can come back and build their sanctuaries, but we cannot go in and destroy them a second time. You are denying the President of the United States, as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces, the right to protect American lives if the Communists return and rebuild their sanctuaries.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON) to close the debate.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, we cannot write war strategy from the floor. A vote on this amendment does not indicate whether one is for or against involvement in Cambodia. A vote against the amendment would support the President, the Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces—and affirm that we do not propose to tie his hands, and that we hold him to his commitment to bring the war to a successful conclusion and at the earliest possible time.

Mr. Chairman, it is not possible to reconstruct or rehash the arguments of yesterday on amendments similar to the one facing us today. But on yesterday the House voted such amendments down by substantial margin.

I think it would be unfortunate, in the eyes of the country and the world, if the House should reverse itself without any substantial reason within a 24-hour period. We must undertake to act responsibly. All Members want to see the war ended on honorable terms at the earliest possible date.

I urge the defeat of the Boland amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND).

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. BOLAND and Mr. MAHON.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 94, noes 163.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE VI GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 601. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year unless expressly so provided therein.

SEC. 602. Except where specifically increased or decreased elsewhere in this Act, the restrictions contained within appropri-

tions, or provisions affecting appropriations or other funds; available during the fiscal year 1970, limiting the amounts which may be expended for personal services, or for purposes involving personal services, or amounts which may be transferred between appropriations or authorizations available for or involving such services, are hereby increased to the extent necessary to meet increased pay costs authorized by or pursuant to law.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. VANIK

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VANIK: On page 46, after line 23, insert the following:

"SEC. 603. None of the funds contained in this act available to the Inter-American Bank shall be used directly or indirectly as grants or loans to officers or members, of the staff, of the Inter-American Bank."

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, some time ago I was shocked to learn that the Inter-American Bank has been making extensive loans to its officers and to its staff.

Mr. Chairman, I have discussed this amendment with the chairman of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations of the Committee on Appropriations, the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. PASSMAN), and I should like to ask at this time if the gentleman from Louisiana could tell me whether I am correct in understanding that over 200 loans have been made to members of the staff and officers of the Inter-American Bank?

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, in response I should like to say to the distinguished gentleman, that is correct. There have been over 200 loans made to members and the staff of the Inter-American Development Bank. It is also true that the Asian Development Bank makes the same cost of loans.

Mr. VANIK. I should like to inquire what kinds of loans these are. Are these personal loans, property purchase loans, or home modernization loans? What type are they?

Mr. PASSMAN. It is a combination of many. In some instances they make home purchase loans. In other instances it is merely a loan over a signature.

Mr. VANIK. Will the distinguished gentleman advise me and advise the members of this Committee as to whether or not the American representative on either the Inter-American Bank or the Asian Development Bank has had access to the information concerning the beneficiaries of these loans or the extent of these loans?

Mr. PASSMAN. I do not quite understand the gentleman's question.

Mr. VANIK. I should like to inquire whether or not the American representative on either the Inter-American Bank or the Asian Development Bank has any information concerning the extent of the loans or the beneficiaries of the loans. Is he advised of this practice?

Mr. PASSMAN. I can only speak with respect to the Asian Development Bank. During our hearings we asked our Director on the Board of the Asian Development Bank if he could furnish us with the names of the individuals borrowing the money, the terms and the amounts, and he said that information was restricted by the President of the Bank. Our own Board member was not privileged to have access as to the amounts of

the loans to the employees of the Asian Development Bank.

Mr. VANIK. Last year, as the gentleman will recall, he made an extensive inquiry concerning whether or not American employees of either of these banks resident in the United States paid Federal income taxes. Can the gentleman advise the Committee whether or not these employees at the present time pay income taxes to the United States?

Mr. PASSMAN. This being an international organization, of course the employees do not pay any income taxes on their salaries. They pay no income taxes on their salaries notwithstanding the fact that they are domiciled here in the United States.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VANIK. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I commend the gentleman for his amendment, and I urge the Committee to accept it. The time is long past due for the placing of restraints on the use of International Bank funds to which Americans have contributed billions of dollars.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. VANIK. I yield further to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. PASSMAN. Of course, I do not have right to accept the amendment, but I am going to support the gentleman's amendment.

The gentleman may recall that I discussed with him earlier the fact that I intended to write this into the legislation this year, providing certain restrictions. As he knows, there will be a request for an additional \$900 million for the Special Fund for the Inter-American Development Bank. We are going to have an additional request for the Asian Development Bank. I thought at that time we would place a limitation on this type of practice, so as to stop the policy of making loans to employees.

It is rather unusual, of course, to have employees living in the District of Columbia and borrowing money from one of these international organizations. They pay no income taxes. Some of these loans are made at interest rates as low as 2 percent. It is time to stop this. That was not the purpose of our country making contributions to these international organizations.

I should say to the gentleman, when we move this money into international organizations we lose the right of an audit and we lose the right to make an investigation or interrogation on the individual projects. It is time that the membership understands fully what we are actually doing.

I commend the gentleman for offering this amendment. If he had not offered the amendment I intended, if the Committee would support me, to write a provision into the regular bill, which would have prohibit this kind of practice.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

(On request of Mr. PATMAN, and by unanimous consent, Mr. VANIK was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VANIK. I am glad to yield to the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. PATMAN. I commend the gentleman for his statement. His statement is shocking to me. I am grateful to him for bringing this information to the attention of the House. Do you have the information that you could submit in the record about the number of these loans?

Mr. VANIK. I do not, but I will be happy to yield to the chairman of the Foreign Aid Subcommittee for that information.

Mr. PATMAN. If the gentleman from Louisiana, the distinguished chairman of that committee, will insert the information, I think it would be a very wholesome and helpful thing. Something should be done about it. It is unthinkable that employees in a tax-exempt status really are allowed to borrow from their own organization, their master and their employer, public funds that are tax exempt.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VANIK. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PASSMAN. This is a sad state of affairs. I have been inclined to point out to the membership of this body for many years as to just what would happen when you move assistance into these international organizations. I am requested by the Secretary of the Treasury not to reveal the list of these people who borrow these moneys, or the amounts, or the interest that they pay. I have the Secretary's letter, and I am going to ask the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency to see if he cannot get the Secretary of the Treasury to permit me to place in the record the names of the individuals, the amounts of the loans, and the rate of interest that they pay. They give varied reasons why the information should not be made public.

Mr. PATMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASSMAN. If the gentleman will permit me to finish. As far as the Asian Development Bank is concerned, which is another international organization, our Board member on that Bank is not privileged to know about these loans, either the amounts or the interest rates. The President will not even let our board member have this information. If you want any additional information on that, I suggest you read my hearings and you will find out for yourself that he is not privileged to receive that information.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VANIK. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CASEY. I wonder if this is not a better rate of interest than they get on other loans.

Mr. VANIK. I do not know. We are not privy to the rate of interest, and I hope that the chairman of the Subcommittee on Foreign Aid will accept my amendment.

Mr. PASSMAN. I do not have the right to accept it, but I will certainly vote for it.

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment because I do not think most understand what we are doing. The Asian Development Bank and the Inter-American Development Bank both come under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Banking and Currency. As a member of that committee, I did not know that these loans were being made until recently. I would certainly cooperate with the chairman of my committee fully in investigating and finding out what is going on.

When it came to my attention I called the institutions involved to find out what these loans represented. They are small loans that are made to employees. Many of these employees have moved to this country from other parts of the world. Their credit is no good and therefore they cannot borrow from an established banking institution in this country. Therefore, it is necessary that they borrow money to set up housekeeping and be able to maintain themselves while they are getting established here. I do not think we want to legislate matters of that substance on this floor without knowing what we are doing. If these employees are not paying the full rates of interest, then I will cooperate fully with the committee chairman to see to it that if they borrow money, they pay the full rate of interest. But they are paying back the loans. You will create a considerable amount of hardship on these employees and it will not do our country any benefit.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLACKBURN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. What is wrong with foreign governments of those countries providing the credit necessary to finance their own employees in this or any other country? Why should we do it?

Mr. BLACKBURN. They are not employees of government. They are employees of international banking institutions.

Let us first examine what we are doing and then let us legislate. Let us not work a hardship upon these people who come here under these circumstances.

Mr. GROSS. I am absolutely opposed to American taxpayers making money available to an international bank to build a golf course for its employees.

Mr. BLACKBURN. I agree.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLACKBURN. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. PASSMAN. It is just this simple. These international organizations provide good jobs for these Americans and some other foreign nationals. They have good salaries. They can borrow money at the commercial banks just like we can.

Mr. BLACKBURN. I am sorry, but I must interrupt the gentleman because I wish to complete my statement. I cannot yield further to the gentleman at this time.

Mr. PASSMAN. Well, I will get my own time later.

Mr. BLACKBURN. I do not want to see us do anything which would greatly adversely affect these people, until we have conducted adequate hearings, which are scheduled this summer. I will fully cooperate in legislation to prevent abuses but we should have all the facts before us.

Mr. GROSS. Why does their own government not provide the credit for them?

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

(Mr. MAHON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

RESTRICTION AGAINST LOANS TO OFFICERS AND STAFF OF INTER-AMERICAN BANK

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, the members of the Banking and Currency Committee no doubt are more familiar with this situation than most of the rest of us. You have heard briefly from the gentleman from Louisiana, and he is going to seek additional time on his own.

From what I know of the matter as a result of this recent discussion, I can see no obvious reason why the amendment should be opposed. I expect to vote for the amendment—and I would assume that the amendment would be approved by the House—as it seems to be meritorious.

However, I must agree that we do not have the full facts in regard to the situation. I am sure the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations of the Committee on Appropriations and the Banking and Currency Committee will go thoroughly into this whole matter. But as of this time, it seems to me that the amendment should be adopted. The gentleman from Ohio had intended to offer the amendment earlier, but at that time the pertinent paragraph of the bill had been passed, and I was not aware of the import of the amendment.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, the members of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations of the Committee on Appropriations seem to favor this amendment. Therefore, in an effort to save time and inasmuch as we know it is going to be adopted, I would suggest we accept it and get on with the business.

Mr. MAHON. Insofar as I am concerned, I accept it.

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Is it not a common practice in banking operations in America that an officer and very often employees of a bank are not granted loans from that particular bank? In other words, if they desire to borrow money, they must go to another institution with which they are not affiliated in order to borrow money?

Mr. MAHON. I am not fully familiar with banking practices, but no doubt certain safeguards are provided.

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. So, it would seem to me we would be placing

no undue hardship upon these individuals if we should say to them that they would have to go to another banking commercial source in order to obtain their money?

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

(Mr. PASSMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, it was my purpose to stay out of this debate on this occasion and discuss the matter with the distinguished minority member from Kansas (Mr. SHRIVER) in the hopes that we could come up with some type of limitation which the committee could support on the regular bill. But it is just this simple. With reference to the two international organizations which we have examined this year—and we may limit our discussion at this particular moment to that of the Inter-American Development Bank—most of these employees draw good salaries and many of course are domiciled right here in the city of Washington because the Inter-American Development Bank is domiciled here.

I am not quarreling with the fact that they do not have to pay any income tax on their salaries because they work for an international organization and we extend to these U.S. employees the same consideration that we extend to foreign nationals who would be working with the bank, even though that is quite a concession. But many of these employees draw their salaries here, and they can borrow money locally.

But, Mr. Chairman, when you build up to where there are over 200 loans made by the banks to their employees, and at a concessionary interest rate, then to me it is wrong because it aggregates several hundreds of thousands of dollars.

This is also true in the case of the Asian Development Bank, but in the case of the Asian Development Bank the President there is so arrogant that he will not disclose to our own board members the amount of these loans.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that this amendment will be adopted, and I hope at some subsequent date that the subcommittee, which I have the honor to chair, working with the distinguished Member from Kansas (Mr. SHRIVER), and the other Members will write legislation completely prohibiting this practice, because it will continue to grow and grow.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, let me say, if I may, that the Asian Development Bank, for the first year of its operation, made a lot of money. In fact, we borrowed some of our own money back.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Kansas (Mr. SHRIVER).

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding to me.

I have just now had the opportunity of reading the amendment, and I see no objection to it, and the ranking member on our subcommittee, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. PASSMAN) agrees.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I would ask the gentleman from Louisiana, Is there any doubt but what we have the authority to act here to bind an organization, made-up of several countries, by an amendment?

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I would say to the gentleman first of all that in this particular organization we put in about 40 percent of the last request for capital, and I do not know why we should not write a limitation into it. If we did not, it would make a mockery of the legislative process to even write such legislation in the beginning.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I have looked at this loan list, which I have seen for the first time, and I notice that almost all of the borrowers have Spanish names.

The first page contains the names of 44 borrowers. Most of the loans are in the area of \$1,000. None is over \$2,000. I notice that is typical throughout this list. They are apparently small loans.

However, on succeeding pages I find one loan relating to home improvement for \$10,000, and another one for \$14,000. These are the biggest ones that I see on this list. There are a total of 239 loans.

I am not so sure we have discussed this problem in the context of reality too well, but I still support the amendment offered by the gentleman. I would hope, however, that there have been no improprieties.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I would only add further that from little acorns big trees grow. If we do not stop this now it will not be too long before all of the employees will utilize this method of securing loans, and do not forget, at concessionary interest rates.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I know that we have reached practically a consensus with respect to this amendment. I shall join in support of the amendment, but I thought that this was an appropriate and important time to discuss some ramifications of this problem.

We are acting with regard to a restriction of limitation to deal with a specific problem. That is fine, but the problem is far broader than that, as the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations has alluded. We have struggled with this question from time to time.

Suffice it to say that in the Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, we are examining the foreign policy implications of U.S. participation in the Inter-American Development Bank, particularly of the recent pledges relating to additional capitalization—which pledges involve a huge sum of money on the part of the United States.

The Committee on Banking and Currency will shortly take up the question of the administration's request with respect to that additional capitalization.

But the problem with which we are struggling in the Inter-American Affairs Subcommittee is a problem that is going to be increasingly troublesome as we attempt to multilateralize our foreign policy undertakings affairs in that it is extremely difficult for us, at the policy level, except in the Department of the Treasury, to obtain information that we need upon which to make our evaluations and our judgments both from a foreign policy standpoint and from a financial standpoint.

We passed an amendment in this House a couple of years ago, pertaining to this very same inter-American institution, in an attempt to get the kind of information that would be produced in any comprehensive audit. We found that they did not have any such audit. All that was being done was a financial audit.

Finally, as the result of an amendment adopted in this body upon the initiation of the Inter-American Affairs Subcommittee, an agreement was reached between the General Accounting Office and the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the guidelines for comprehensive audits that should be instituted by the affected institution. But that audit will still be primarily internal. There remains the question and the problem, therefore, for the Committee on Banking and Currency and the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Congress to get all of the detailed information to make sound judgments with respect to putting funds into multilateral institutions and the foreign policy implication of such decisions.

It is that problem that is going to have to be resolved at the very highest levels in this Government, if we are going to have some kind of coordinated foreign policy and some kind of intelligent handling of funds which we are putting into the Inter-American Development Bank and other multilateral institutions.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I do not know how many times I have voted on amendments not really knowing what the substance of the amendments was.

I am very much opposed to this amendment because it adversely affects the International Development Bank and indirectly the Asian Development Bank.

These are important multinational banks, not American banks. The people who work for these banks are international civil servants. They do not work in the United States or Argentina or Columbia or in any specific country. They are international civil servants working for this multinational bank.

When they come to this country they do not have a credit rating. I do not care if they are making \$2,000 a month, they do not have a credit rating. They have to live here for a while before they can go to a commercial bank and borrow on their signature and against their pay the \$1,000 or \$2,000 they need to settle their family here.

It is a problem that we definitely have with the Asian Development Bank now moving to Manila, Philippine Islands. They do not have credit ratings so they have to borrow from the institution they work for.

We should not be so shocked. We have a very good bank here in the House that has a very good interest rate. Quite a few of us, I suspect, have used that bank for borrowing. And with the IDB we are talking about people who do not have a local credit rating who have extra money needs as international civil servants when they move to a new country.

This is the type of loan fund that we are going to cut out. I really do not think this type of amendment is legal because the funds are funds of the bank and not the funds of the United States.

I do not think this amendment has any effect because we are talking of an international bank and not a United States bank or a Treasury bank.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman from California is making a point that troubled me as soon as I found out what the amendment is about.

It is an intriguing amendment, but I just wonder what kind of policy we will be pursuing if we dictate to an international organization composed, I think, of some 22 member nations. It seems to me it might not only be a bad way to legislate, but bad diplomacy in dealing with all the other member nations.

Mr. REES. I agree it is bad diplomacy.

I think we will hurt a lot of small people who serve this bank as international civil servants who, when they come here do not have funds available.

Mr. STANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. STANTON. Mr. Chairman, I join the gentleman in his remarks in opposition to this particular amendment.

At this particular time, I say to the members of the committee, that we will have before the next 6 weeks supplemental funding hearings asking for funds both for the Inter-American Development Bank and the Asian Development Bank.

I say to the gentleman that once again I agree with the majority leader that this is an international member civil organization, and I say to the House once again and the majority leader that we can no more, in my opinion, do to the Inter-American Development Bank what this amendment would do at this particular time than, for example, we could do to the United Nations. This committee could control, perhaps, funds to Cuba, but we do not go to the individual employees of the United Nations and tell them where they can or cannot borrow money. I think we have a direct parallel to that particular situation. I join the gentleman from Ohio in asking the chairman of our committee, the gentleman from Texas, to thoroughly go into the subject of this amendment, and where legally we have the right, we should act.

I want the gentleman to know I agree in principle with him. We should let our Banking and Currency Committee thoroughly check this out.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VANIK. Is the gentleman able to tell us what the rate on those loans is? I will tell the gentleman I have every reason to believe it is a most favorable rate, not available to anyone else in the United States.

Mr. REES. Like the rate that we have in the House Bank.

Mr. VANIK. No; this is a preferential, low-interest loan, a rate that is not available to anyone else in this community.

Mr. REES. I suspect that when the Banking and Currency Committee looks at this, they will go into the subject of interest rates.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the next to the last word.

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, apparently about all some people think the taxpayers of this country should do is provide these international banks with money. Just give them the money and let them do whatever they please with it.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Louisiana who has had long experience with this subject.

Mr. PASSMAN. A Member came to me earlier and said, "As chairman, why did you not reduce the supplemental request?"

The reason was the executive branch said no, this is a commitment. We made the commitment to other member countries to furnish all the money that we are requesting. However, if we turn all the operations over to the internationalists, we will not be able to control the funds provided by the United States. I think we have a perfect right to prevent these people from taking our money and making these loans at a concessionary interest rate to employees of the bank, and I certainly hope that this amendment is adopted. It will demonstrate that we have a little courage in this Congress, not yielding every time to some internationalists who are spending our money.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CASEY. The gentleman will recall that about 3 years ago I called attention to the fact that one of the international organizations is building a country club out here on River Road.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. CASEY. If the gentleman has been in that area, he has observed that it has developed really well. I do not know how many millions of dollars they have in that country club. Again, this is a situation about which we are told we have nothing to say since it is an international organization.

Mr. GROSS. It is my recollection that the cost of the land alone for that country club was about \$2 million.

Mr. CASEY. No; only about \$1.5 million. They have since built a golf course and put in a club. You and I do not have anything to say about it; we merely furnish money for it.

Mr. GROSS. If foreign governments cannot lend a hand to settle their employees in this country or anywhere else, then they had better get out of these international banks because they are bankrupt anyway.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. VANIK and Mr. REES.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 69, noes 63.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time for the purpose of informing the Committee that if the previous question on the motion to recommit is voted down—and I trust it will be—I intend to offer an amendment to the motion to recommit embodying the amendment which I offered in the Committee of the Whole; a straight vote on whether or not we ought to permit any American ground combat forces in Cambodia in fiscal year 1971. This House should face this issue squarely and on a roll call vote.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. O'HARA, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 17399) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY
MR. CEDERBERG

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. CEDERBERG. I am in its present form, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CEDERBERG moves to recommit the bill H.R. 17399 to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appears to have it.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 220, nays 134, not voting 75, as follows:

[Roll No. 107]

YEAS—220

Abbitt	Downing	Mathias
Abernethy	Duncan	May
Adair	Edmondson	Mayne
Albert	Edwards, Ala.	Michel
Alexander	Edwards, La.	Miller, Calif.
Anderson, Ill.	Erlenborn	Mills
Anderson, Tenn.	Eshleman	Minshall
Andrews,	Feighan	Mize
N. Dak.	Findley	Mizell
Annuizio	Fisher	Montgomery
Arends	Flood	Morgan
Ashbrook	Flynt	Morton
Aspinall	Foreman	Murphy, N.Y.
Ayres	Fountain	Myers
Baring	Frey	Natcher
Beall, Md.	Fulton, Tenn.	Nelsen
Belcher	Fuqua	Nichols
Bennett	Garmatz	O'Konski
Betts	Goldwater	O'Neal, Ga.
Bevill	Goodling	Passman
Blackburn	Gray	Patman
Blanton	Griffin	Pelly
Boggs	Gross	Perkins
Bow	Gubser	Pettis
Brinkley	Haley	Pickle
Brooks	Hall	Pirnie
Broomfield	Hammer-	Poff
Brotzman	schmidt	Price, Ill.
Brown, Ohio	Hansen, Idaho	Price, Tex.
Broyhill, N.C.	Harvey	Pucinski
Broyhill, Va.	Hastings	Quie
Buchanan	Hébert	Quillen
Burke, Fla.	Henderson	Railsback
Burleson, Tex.	Hogan	Randall
Burlison, Mo.	Holifield	Rarick
Bush	Hosmer	Reid, Ill.
Byrnes, Wis.	Hutchinson	Reifel
Cabell	Ichord	Rhodes
Caffery	Johnson, Pa.	Rivers
Camp	Jonas	Roberts
Casey	Jones, Ala.	Rogers, Fla.
Cederberg	Jones, N.C.	Rooney, N.Y.
Chamberlain	King	Rostenkowski
Chappell	Kleppe	Roth
Clancy	Kluczynski	Sandman
Clausen,	Kuykendall	Satterfield
Don H.	Kyl	Saylor
Clawson, Del	Landgrebe	Schadeberg
Collier	Landrum	Scherle
Collins	Latta	Schwengel
Colmer	Lennon	Scott
Conable	Long, La.	Sebelius
Corbett	Lukens	Shriver
Cowger	McClure	Sisk
Crane	McCulloch	Skubitz
Daniel, Va.	McDonald,	Slack
Davis, Ga.	Mich.	Smith, Calif.
Davis, Wis.	McEwen	Smith, Iowa
Dellenback	McFall	Smith, N.Y.
Denney	McKneally	Snyder
Dennis	MacGregor	Springer
Devine	Mahon	Stanton
Diggs	Mailliard	Steed
Dorn	Mann	Steiger, Ariz.
Dowdy	Marsh	Steiger, Wis.
	Martin	Stephens

Stratton
Stubblefield
Stuckey
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, Ga.
Thomson, Wis.
Waggonner

Wampler
Watkins
Watson
Watts
Whalley
White
Whitehurst
Whitten
Williams

Winn
Wright
Wyatt
Wylie
Wyman
Young
Zablocki
Zion
Zwach

NAYS—134

Adams	Gallagher	Nix
Addabbo	Gaydos	Obey
Anderson,	Giaimo	O'Hara
Calif.	Gibbons	Olsen
Ashley	Green, Oreg.	O'Neill, Mass.
Barrett	Green, Pa.	Pepper
Biaggi	Griffiths	Philbin
Biester	Grover	Pike
Bingham	Gude	Podell
Boland	Halpern	Powell
Bolling	Hamilton	Preyer, N.C.
Brademas	Hanley	Rees
Brasco	Hanna	Reid, N.Y.
Burke, Mass.	Hansen, Wash.	Reuss
Burton, Calif.	Harrington	Riegle
Button	Hathaway	Robison
Byrne, Pa.	Hawkins	Rodino
Carey	Hechler, W. Va.	Roe
Cleveland	Heckler, Mass.	Rogers, Colo.
Cohelan	Helstoski	Rooney, Pa.
Conte	Hicks	Rosenthal
Conyers	Horton	Roybal
Corman	Howard	Ruppe
Coughlin	Hungate	Ryan
Culver	Jacobs	St Germain
Daddario	Karth	Scheuer
Daniels, N.J.	Kastenmeier	Shipley
Derwinski	Koch	Stafford
Donohue	Kyros	Staggers
Dulski	Leggett	Stokes
Dwyer	Long, Md.	Sullivan
Eckhardt	Lowenstein	Symington
Edwards, Calif.	McCloskey	Thompson, N.J.
Eilberg	McDade	Tieman
Esch	Macdonald,	Udall
Evans, Colo.	Mass.	Ullman
Farbstein	Matsunaga	Vander Jagt
Fascell	Meeds	Vanik
Fish	Mikva	Vigorito
Ford,	Miller, Ohio	Waldie
William D.	Minish	Whalen
Fraser	Mink	Widnall
Frelinghuysen	Monagan	Wolff
Friedel	Morse	Wydler
Fulton, Pa.	Mosher	Yates
Galifianakis	Nedzi	

NOT VOTING—75

Andrews, Ala.	Ford, Gerald R.	Moorhead
Bell, Calif.	Gettys	Moss
Berry	Gilbert	Murphy, Ill.
Blatnik	Gonzalez	Ottenger
Bray	Hagan	Patten
Brock	Harsha	Poage
Brown, Calif.	Hays	Pollock
Brown, Mich.	Hull	Pryor, Ark.
Burton, Utah	Hunt	Purcell
Carter	Jarman	Roudebush
Celler	Johnson, Calif.	Ruth
Chisholm	Jones, Tenn.	Schneebeli
Clark	Kazen	Sikes
Clay	Kee	Taft
Cramer	Keith	Teague, Calif.
Cunningham	Kirwan	Tunney
Dawson	Langen	Van Deerlin
de la Garza	Lloyd	Weicker
Delaney	Lujan	Wiggins
Dent	McCarthy	Wilson, Bob
Dickinson	McClory	Wilson,
Dingell	McMillan	Charles H.
Evins, Tenn.	Madden	Wold
Fallon	Melcher	Yatron
Flowers	Meskill	
Foley	Mollohan	

So the previous question was ordered. The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Johnson of California for, with Mr. Gilbert against.

Mr. Hays for, with Mr. Foley against.

Mr. McMillan for, with Mr. Moorhead against.

Mr. Andrews of Alabama for, with Mr. Celler against.

Mr. Evins of Tennessee for, with Mr. Dent against.

Mr. Fallon for, with Mr. Schneebeli against.

Mr. Clark for, with Mr. Lujan against.

Mr. Delaney for, with Mr. Moss against.

Mr. Gettys for, with Mr. Pyror of Arkansas against.
 Mr. Gonzalez for, with Mr. Blatnik against.
 Mr. Hogan for, with Mr. Brown of California against.
 Mr. Hull for, with Mr. Dingell against.
 Mr. Jarman for, with Mr. Madden against.
 Mr. Jones of Tennessee for, with Mr. McCarthy against.
 Mr. Kazen for, with Mr. Clay against.
 Mr. Hunt for, with Mr. Melcher against.
 Mr. Murphy of Illinois for, with Mrs. Chisholm against.
 Mr. Sikes for, with Mr. Ottinger against.
 Mr. Bob Wilson for, with Mr. Patten against.
 Mr. Cunningham for, with Mr. Van Deerlin against.
 Mr. Bray for, with Mr. Charles H. Wilson against.
 Mr. Meskill for, with Mr. Yatron against.
 Mr. Weicker for, with Mr. Dawson against.

Until further notice:

Mr. de la Garza with Mr. Bell of California.
 Mr. Flowers with Mr. Brock.
 Mr. Kee with Mr. Berry.
 Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Carter.
 Mr. Madden with Mr. Brown of Michigan.
 Mr. Tunney with Mr. Cramer.
 Mr. Purcell with Mr. Burton of Utah.
 Mr. Mollohan with Mr. Dickinson.
 Mr. Roudebush with Mr. Teague of California.
 Mr. Keith with Mr. McClory.
 Mr. Ruth with Mr. Langen.
 Mr. Lloyd with Mr. Taft.
 Mr. Pollock with Mr. Harsha.
 Mr. Wiggins with Mr. Wold.

Mr. BROOKS changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. FISH changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 333, nays 6, not voting 90, as follows:

[Roll No. 108]

YEAS—333

Abbitt	Brasco	Corbett
Abernethy	Brinkley	Corman
Adair	Brooks	Coughlin
Adams	Broomfield	Cowger
Albert	Brotzman	Crane
Alexander	Brown, Ohio	Culver
Anderson, Calif.	Broyhill, N.C.	Daddario
Anderson, Ill.	Broyhill, Va.	Daniel, Va.
Anderson, Tenn.	Buchanan	Daniels, N.J.
Andrews, N. Dak.	Burke, Fla.	Davis, Ga.
Annunzio	Burke, Mass.	Davis, Wis.
Arends	Burlison, Tex.	Dellenback
Ashbrook	Burlison, Mo.	Denney
Ashley	Burton, Calif.	Dennis
Aspinall	Bush	Devine
Ayres	Button	Diggs
Baring	Byrne, Pa.	Donohue
Barrett	Byrnes, Wis.	Dorn
Beall, Md.	Cabell	Dowdy
Belcher	Caffery	Downing
Bennett	Camp	Dulski
Betts	Casey	Duncan
Bevill	Chamberlain	Dwyer
Biaggi	Chappell	Eckhardt
Bieber	Clancy	Edmondson
Bingham	Clausen,	Edwards, Ala.
Blackburn	Don H.	Edwards, Calif.
Blanton	Clawson, Del.	Edwards, La.
Boggs	Cleveland	Ellberg
Boland	Cohelan	Esch
Bolling	Collier	Eshleman
Bow	Collins	Evans, Colo.
Brademas	Colmer	Farbstein
	Conable	Fascell
	Conate	Feighan
	Conyers	Findley

Fish	McClure	Rogers, Colo.
Fisher	McCulloch	Rogers, Fla.
Flood	McDade	Rooney, N.Y.
Flynt	McDonald,	Rooney, Pa.
Ford,	Mich.	Rostenkowski
William D.	McEwen	Roth
Fountain	McFall	Roybal
Fraser	McKneally	Ruppe
Frelinghuysen	Macdonald,	Ryan
Frey	Mass.	St Germain
Friedel	MacGregor	Sandman
Fulton, Pa.	Mahon	Satterfield
Fulton, Tenn.	Mailliard	Saylor
Fuqua	Mann	Schadeberg
Galifianakis	Marsh	Scherle
Gallagher	Martin	Scheuer
Garmatz	Mathias	Schwengel
Gaydos	Matsunaga	Scott
Gialmo	May	Sebelius
Gibbons	Mayne	Shipley
Goldwater	Meeds	Shriver
Gonzalez	Michel	Sisk
Goodling	Mikva	Skubitz
Gray	Miller, Calif.	Slack
Green, Oreg.	Miller, Ohio	Smith, Calif.
Green, Pa.	Mills	Smith, Iowa
Griffin	Minish	Smith, N.Y.
Grover	Mink	Snyder
Gubser	Minshall	Springer
Gude	Mize	Stafford
Haley	Monagan	Staggers
Halpern	Montgomery	Stanton
Hamilton	Morgan	Steed
Hammer-	Morse	Steiger, Ariz.
schmidt	Morton	Steiger, Wis.
Hanley	Mosher	Stephens
Hanna	Murphy, N.Y.	Stokes
Hansen, Idaho	Myers	Stratton
Hansen, Wash.	Natcher	Stubblefield
Harrington	Nedzi	Sullivan
Harvey	Nelsen	Talcott
Hastings	Nichols	Taylor
Hawkins	Nix	Teague, Tex.
Hébert	Obey	Thompson, Ga.
Hechler, W. Va.	O'Hara	Thompson, N.J.
Heckler, Mass.	Olsen	Thomson, Wis.
Helstoski	O'Neal, Ga.	Tiernan
Henderson	O'Neill, Mass.	Udall
Hicks	Passman	Ullman
Hogan	Patman	Vander Jagt
Holifield	Pelly	Vanik
Horton	Pepper	Vigorito
Hosmer	Perkins	Waggonner
Howard	Pettis	Waldie
Hungate	Pickle	Wampler
Hutchinson	Pike	Watkins
Jacobs	Pirnie	Watson
Johnson, Pa.	Podell	Watts
Jonas	Poff	Weicker
Jones, Ala.	Preyer, N.C.	Whalen
Jones, N.C.	Price, Ill.	Whalley
Karth	Price, Tex.	White
Kastenmeier	Pucinski	Whitehurst
King	Quie	Whitten
Kleppe	Quillen	Widnall
Koch	Railsback	Williams
Kuykendall	Randall	Winn
Kyl	Rees	Wolff
Kyros	Reid, Ill.	Wyatt
Landgrebe	Reid, N.Y.	Wylder
Landrum	Reifel	Wylie
Latta	Reuss	Wyman
Leggett	Rhodes	Yates
Long, La.	Rivers	Young
Long, Md.	Roberts	Zablocki
Lowenstein	Robison	Zion
Lukens	Rodino	Zwach
McCloskey	Roe	

NAYS—6

Cederberg	Hall	Powell
Gross	O'Konski	Rarick

NOT VOTING—90

Addabbo	Dingell	Kirwan
Andrews, Ala.	Erlenborn	Kluczynski
Bell, Calif.	Evins, Tenn.	Langen
Berry	Fallon	Lennon
Blatnik	Flowers	Lloyd
Bray	Foley	Lujan
Brock	Ford, Gerald R.	McCarthy
Brown, Calif.	Foreman	McClory
Brown, Mich.	Gettys	McMillan
Burton, Utah	Gilbert	Madden
Carey	Griffiths	Melcher
Carter	Hagan	Meskill
Celler	Harsha	Mizell
Chisholm	Hathaway	Mollohan
Clark	Hays	Moorhead
Clay	Hull	Moss
Cramer	Hunt	Murphy, Ill.
Cunningham	Ichord	Ottinger
Dawson	Jarman	Patten
de la Garza	Johnson, Calif.	Philbin
Delaney	Jones, Tenn.	Poage
Dent	Kazen	Pollock
Derwinski	Kee	Pryor, Ark.
Dickinson	Keith	Purcell

Riegle	Symington	Wilson,
Rosenthal	Taft	Charles H.
Roudebush	Teague, Calif.	Wold
Ruth	Tunney	Wright
Schneebell	Van Deerlin	Yatron
Sikes	Wiggins	
Stuckey	Wilson, Bob	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hays with Mr. Gerald R. Ford.
Mr. Gilbert with Mr. Pollock.
Mr. Addabbo with Mr. Lloyd.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Hunt.
Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Langen.
Mr. Moorhead with Mr. Brown of Michigan.
Mr. Patten with Mr. Keith.
Mr. Evins with Mr. Berry.
Mr. Delaney with Mr. Cunningham.
Mr. Carey with Mr. Teague of California.
Mr. Fallon with Mr. Bray.
Mr. Sikes with Mr. Lujan.
Mr. Rosenthal with Mr. Bell of California.
Mr. Hathaway with Mr. Foreman.
Mr. Melcher with Mr. Derwinski.
Mr. Hogan with Mr. Brock.
Mr. Foley with Mr. Harsha.
Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Bob Wilson.
Mr. Johnson of California with Mr. Roudebush.
Mr. Hull with Mr. McClory.
Mr. Andrews of Alabama with Mr. Carter.
Mr. Clark with Mr. Meskill.
Mr. Dent with Mr. Schneebeli.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Ruth.
Mr. Philbin with Mr. Burton of Utah.
Mr. Purcell with Mr. Cramer.
Mr. Gettys with Mr. Dickinson.
Mr. Yatron with Mr. Riegle.
Mr. Jones of Tennessee with Mr. Taft.
Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Erlenborn.
Mr. Flowers with Mr. Mize.
Mrs. Griffiths with Mr. Wiggins.
Mr. Mollohan with Mr. Wold.
Mr. Moss with Mr. Kirwan.
Mr. Van Deerlin with Mr. Clay.
Mr. Casey with Mr. Murphy of Illinois.
Mr. Ottinger with Mrs. Chisholm.
Mr. Pryor of Arkansas with Mr. Stuckey.
Mr. Wright with Mr. Tunney.
Mr. Ichord with Mr. Brown of California.
Mr. Jarman with Mr. Kee.
Mr. Lennon with Mr. McCarthy.
Mr. McMillan with Mr. Symington.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and that all Members speaking on the bill may extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES TO FILE REPORT

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tomorrow night to file a privileged report.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. ARENDS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I would ask the majority leader to please advise us as to the program for the balance of this week, if any, and the program for next week.

Mr. ALBERT. We did have one other bill programed, but it is so late that we decided to put it over until Monday.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the program for next week is as follows:

Monday is District day. There are six bills:

H.R. 670: To amend the District of Columbia Public Assistance Act of 1962; H.R. 9017: To amend the Alcoholic Beverage Control Act;

H.R. 15033: To authorize the gift of decedent's body;

H.R. 16476: To legalize kite flying in the District of Columbia;

S. 1458: To prohibit the business of debt adjusting; and

H.R. 17138: District of Columbia police, firemen, and teachers salary increases.

Also on Monday, we have scheduled:

H.R. 16595: Authorizing appropriations to the National Science Foundation (open rule, 1 hour of debate); and

H.J. Res. 1117: To establish a Joint Committee on Environment and Technology (1 hour of debate).

On Tuesday:

Independent offices and Department of Housing and Urban Development appropriation bill, fiscal year 1971; and

H. Res. 796: Amending the Rules of the House of Representatives relating to financial disclosure (open rule, 1 hour of debate).

For Wednesday and the balance of the week; there is:

H. Res. 960: Disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1970;

Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the judiciary appropriation bill, fiscal year 1971; and

H.R. 14685: To amend the International Travel Act of 1971 (open rule, 1 hour of debate).

The announcement is made subject to the usual reservation that conference reports may be brought up at any time and that any further program may be announced later.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman tell us what decedent's body is to be given away?

Mr. ALBERT. If the gentleman from Illinois will yield, I do not have the slightest idea. But I hope it is not the gentleman's or mine—at least during this current calendar year.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I find myself in agreement with the gentleman.

Mr. ARENDS. May I say to the gentleman from Iowa, I hope he is here when we take up these bills on the legislative program.

DISPENSING WITH BUSINESS IN ORDER UNDER CALENDAR WEDNESDAY RULE ON WEDNESDAY NEXT.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that any business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule may be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

CORRECTION OF THE RECORD

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 6, 1970, my remarks at page H3933 in the last paragraph of those remarks, it is stated "If we must endorse." This is incorrect and it should read, "If we must endure." I ask unanimous consent that the RECORD be corrected to read accordingly.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

CORRECTION OF VOTE

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 107 I am recorded as not voting. I was present and voted "yea." I ask unanimous consent that the permanent RECORD be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

CORRECTION OF VOTE

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 108 I am recorded as not voting. I was present and voted "yea." I ask unanimous consent that the permanent RECORD be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 108 I was inadvertently detained. I merely wish to state that had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

DEATH ON THE CAMPUS

(Mr. ADDABBO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, the news of new unrest on college campuses this past week came as no surprise to the American people but the news that four students had been killed has caused millions of Americans to wonder in their

shock what the next episode in confrontation between campus dissenters and law enforcement officers might produce.

The primary responsibility of the Federal Government through the President is to bring about appropriate conditions for the control of violence and to calm those whose impulses tend toward further violence.

Unfortunately this administration has aggravated the conditions which divide our Nation by statements designed to turn public opinion against those who protest Government policies.

If this situation persists, there can be little hope of realizing this administration's goal of bringing us together. Instead we will venture on a path of further violence and we will suffer the consequences of an undeclared war between those who hold political power and those who protest the way in which that power is being used.

Mr. Speaker, it would serve little purpose to debate in this forum the merits of the rationale of the dissenters or for that matter the need to maintain order, enforce the laws, and contain violence. Cliches are not needed but rather dedication to a new communication and understanding by all sides is urgently needed.

We have had some experience with violence over the past few years and we must learn from that experience if we are to prevent further bloodshed. In particular the work of the Commission on Violence, chaired by Dr. Milton Eisenhower, has been helpful in understanding the problems and dangers which we face. I would urge the President at this critical point in the history of the politics of confrontation, to assign to the Eisenhower Commission the task of recommending new and bold steps to improve communication between Government and the young people of this Nation in an effort to avert the horrors of needless death and violence.

The efforts of such a Commission, acting as consultant to Government as well as a willing sounding board for youth, can take us on that first step in the development of a national policy which can bring us together. The breakdown of respect for authority and the resulting breakdown of law and order can only be corrected by addressing ourselves to the breakdown of communication between Government and our young people. Re-activation of the Eisenhower Commission on a priority basis may provide us with some new approaches to this communication crisis.

A DEMAND FOR ANSWERS ON PROFESSIONALISM IN SOVIET SPORTS

(Mr. VAN DEERLIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, even though ostensibly amateur sports are a large and lucrative business for successful practitioners in the Soviet Union, the International Olympic Committee apparently is giving serious considera-

91ST CONGRESS
2^D SESSION

H. R. 17399

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

MAY 11, 1970

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Appropriations

AN ACT

Making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending
June 30, 1970, and for other purposes.

- 1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That the following sums are appropriated out of any money

1 in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to supply supple-
2 mental appropriations (this Act may be cited as the "Second
3 Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1970") for the fiscal year
4 ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes, namely:

5 TITLE I

6 CHAPTER I

7 DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

8 EXTENSION SERVICE

9 COOPERATIVE EXTENSION WORK, PAYMENTS, AND

10 EXPENSES

11 For an additional amount for "Cooperative extension
12 work, payments and expenses" for "Retirement and em-
13 ployees' compensation costs for extension agents", not to
14 exceed \$597,000 to be derived by transfer from the appro-
15 priation for "Payments to States and Puerto Rico", fiscal
16 year 1970.

17 CHAPTER II

18 DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—MILITARY

19 RETIRED MILITARY PERSONNEL

20 RETIRED PAY, DEFENSE

21 For an additional amount for "Retired pay, Defense,"
22 \$99,000,000.

CHAPTER III

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

FEDERAL FUNDS

LOANS TO THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FOR CAPITAL

OUTLAY

For an additional amount for "Loans to the District of Columbia for capital outlay", \$1,293,000, to remain available until expended and to be advanced to the general fund upon request of the Commissioner.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FUNDS

GENERAL OPERATING EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "General operating expenses", \$2,675.

PUBLIC SAFETY

For an additional amount for "Public safety", including purchase of sixty passenger motor vehicles for police-type use which may exceed the general purchase price limitation for the current fiscal year by not in excess of \$400 per vehicle, \$2,370,500.

The limitation on the expenditure of funds by the Chief of Police for prevention and detection of crime during the current fiscal year shall be \$100,000.

PARKS AND RECREATION

For an additional amount for "Parks and recreation", \$47,300.

1 CAPITAL OUTLAY

2 For an additional amount for "Capital outlay", to remain
3 available until expended, \$1,658,000.

4 DIVISION OF EXPENSES

5 The sums appropriated herein for the District of Colum-
6 bia shall be paid out of the general fund of the District of
7 Columbia, except as otherwise specifically provided.

8 CHAPTER IV

9 FOREIGN OPERATIONS

10 FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

11 INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL INSTITUTION

12 INVESTMENT IN INTER-AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK

13 For an additional amount for subscription to the Inter-
14 American Development Bank, to remain available until ex-
15 pended, \$205,880,000, for the second of two installments
16 of the United States share in the authorized increase in call-
17 able capital stock of the Bank.

18 CHAPTER V

19 INDEPENDENT OFFICES

20 CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

21 FEDERAL LABOR RELATIONS COUNCIL

22 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

23 The limitation heretofore provided on the rate of com-
24 pensation for the public members of the Federal Service Im-
25 passes Panel is increased to a rate of not to exceed the per
26 diem rate equivalent to the rate for grade GS-18.

1 COMMISSION ON POPULATION GROWTH AND
2 THE AMERICAN FUTURE
3 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

4 For expenses necessary for the Commission on Popula-
5 tion Growth and the American Future, including services as
6 authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, and hire of passenger motor
7 vehicles, \$965,000, to remain available until expended.

8 SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM
9 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

10 For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses",
11 \$7,000,000.

12 VETERANS ADMINISTRATION
13 COMPENSATION AND PENSIONS

14 For an additional amount for "Compensation and pen-
15 sions", \$273,045,000, to remain available until expended.

16 READJUSTMENT BENEFITS

17 For an additional amount for "Readjustment benefits",
18 \$327,500,000, to remain available until expended.

19 MEDICAL CARE

20 For an additional amount for "Medical care", \$113,-
21 500,000.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the Council on Environmental Quality in carrying out its functions under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (Public Law 91-190), including hire of passenger motor vehicles and partial support of the cabinet committee on environmental quality, and the Citizens' Advisory Committee on Environmental Quality, established by Executive Order 11472 of May 29, 1969, or any amendatory order, \$100,000.

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

DISASTER RELIEF

For an additional amount for "Disaster Relief", \$75,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That not to exceed 3 per centum of the foregoing amount shall be available for administrative expenses.

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN

DEVELOPMENT

RENEWAL AND HOUSING ASSISTANCE

LOW RENT PUBLIC HOUSING ANNUAL CONTRIBUTIONS

For an additional amount for "Low-rent public housing annual contributions", fiscal year 1969, \$13,616,000.

COLLEGE HOUSING

The limitation on total payments that may be required in any fiscal year by all contracts for annual grants with

1 educational institutions entered into pursuant to Section 401
2 of the Housing Act of 1950, as amended (82 Stat. 604),
3 is increased by \$5,000,000.

4 MORTGAGE CREDIT

5 FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

6 HOMEOWNERSHIP AND RENTAL HOUSING ASSISTANCE

7 The limitation on total payments that may be required
8 in any fiscal year by all contracts entered into under section
9 235 of the National Housing Act, as amended (82 Stat.
10 477), is increased by \$35,000,000, and the limitation on
11 total payments under those entered into under section 236
12 of such Act (82 Stat. 498), is increased by \$35,000,000.

13 CHAPTER VI

14 DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

15 BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

16 MANAGEMENT OF LANDS AND RESOURCES

17 For an additional amount for "Management of lands and
18 resources," \$23,790,000.

19 BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

20 RESOURCES MANAGEMENT

21 For an additional amount for "Resources management,"
22 \$700,000.

23 BUREAU OF OUTDOOR RECREATION

24 LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION

25 For an additional amount for "Land and Water Con-
26 servation," to remain available until expended, \$7,100,000,

1 to be derived from the Land and Water Conservation Fund,
2 and to be available to the National Park Service for property
3 acquisition authorized by the act of September 13, 1962
4 (Public Law 87-657), as amended.

5 OFFICE OF TERRITORIES

6 ADMINISTRATION OF TERRITORIES

7 For an additional amount for "Administration of Ter-
8 ritories," \$275,000, to remain available until expended.

9 NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

10 MANAGEMENT AND PROTECTION

11 For an additional amount for "Management and Pro-
12 tection," \$850,000.

13 RELATED AGENCIES

14 DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

15 FOREST SERVICE

16 FOREST PROTECTION AND UTILIZATION

17 For an additional amount for "Forest protection and
18 utilization," for "Forest land management", \$21,000,000.

1 NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE
2 HUMANITIES

3 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

4 In addition to amounts heretofore appropriated under
5 this heading there are appropriated amounts equal to the
6 total amount of gifts, bequests, and devises of money, and
7 other property received by each Endowment, during the cur-
8 rent and preceding fiscal years, under the provisions of sec-
9 tion 10 (a) (2) of the National Foundation on the Arts and
10 Humanities Act of 1965, as amended, but not to exceed a
11 total of \$2,000,000, to remain available until expended.

12 CHAPTER VII

13 DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

14 BUREAU OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY

15 UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

16 AND EX-SERVICEMEN

17 For an additional amount for "Unemployment compensa-
18 tion for Federal employees and ex-servicemen", \$50,000,000.

1 LIMITATION ON GRANTS TO STATES FOR UNEMPLOYMENT
2 COMPENSATION AND EMPLOYMENT SERVICE ADMINIS-
3 TRATION

4 For an additional amount for "Limitation on grants to
5 States for unemployment compensation and employment
6 service administration", \$10,000,000, to be expended from
7 the employment security administration account in the
8 Unemployment Trust fund.

9 WAGE AND LABOR STANDARDS ADMINISTRATION
10 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

11 For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses",
12 \$37,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$43,000 may be
13 transferred from the amounts herein and heretofore appro-
14 priated for "Salaries and expenses" for the current fiscal year
15 to the fund created by section 44 of the Longshoremen's and
16 Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, as amended.

17 OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

18 FEDERAL CONTRACT COMPLIANCE AND CIVIL RIGHTS
19 PROGRAM

20 For an additional amount for "Federal contract compli-
21 ance and civil rights program, salaries and expenses",
22 \$107,000.

1 DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND
2 WELFARE

3 SOCIAL AND REHABILITATION SERVICE

4 GRANTS TO STATES FOR PUBLIC ASSISTANCE

5 For an additional amount for "Grants to States for
6 public assistance," \$146,753,000.

7 SPECIAL INSTITUTIONS

8 HOWARD UNIVERSITY

9 CONSTRUCTION

10 For an additional amount for "Construction", \$7,700,-
11 000, to remain available until expended.

12 CHAPTER VIII

13 LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

14 HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

15 SALARIES, MILEAGE FOR THE MEMBERS, AND EXPENSE

16 ALLOWANCE OF THE SPEAKER

17 COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS

18 For an additional amount for "Compensation of mem-
19 bers", \$47,000.

20 SALARIES, OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

21 COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

22 For an additional amount for "Committee on Appro-
23 priations", \$35,555.

1 CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE HOUSE

2 MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS

3 For an additional amount for "Miscellaneous items",
4 \$50,000.

5 SPECIAL AND SELECT COMMITTEES

6 For an additional amount for "Special and select com-
7 mittees", \$100,000, to remain available until expended under
8 the provisions of House Resolution 710, Ninety-first
9 Congress.

10 GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

11 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

12 For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses",
13 \$499,000.

14 CHAPTER IX

15 PUBLIC WORKS

16 DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

17 BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

18 COLORADO RIVER BASIN PROJECT

19 For an additional amount for "Colorado River Basin
20 Project", to remain available until expended, \$6,563,000,
21 to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Con-
22 struction and rehabilitation".

CHAPTER X

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND CONFERENCES

CONTRIBUTIONS TO INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

For an additional amount for "Contributions to international organizations", \$1,600,000.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses, Immigration and Naturalization Service", \$892,000.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

NINETEENTH DECENNIAL CENSUS

For an additional amount for the "Nineteenth decennial census", \$11,000,000, to remain available until December 31, 1972.

OFFICE OF FIELD SERVICES

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", \$105,000.

1 THE JUDICIARY

2 CUSTOMS COURT

3 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

4 For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses",
5 \$18,000.

6 COURTS OF APPEALS, DISTRICT COURTS, AND OTHER

7 JUDICIAL SERVICES

8 SALARIES AND EXPENSES, UNITED STATES MAGISTRATES

9 For "Salaries and expenses, United States magistrates",
10 \$550,000.

11 FEES AND EXPENSES OF COURT-APPOINTED COUNSEL

12 For an additional amount for "Fees and expenses of
13 court-appointed counsel", \$1,150,000.

14 For an additional amount for "Fees and expenses of
15 court-appointed counsel", \$300,000, fiscal year 1969.

16 FEES OF JURORS AND COMMISSIONERS

17 For an additional amount for "Fees of jurors and com-
18 missioners", \$500,000.

19 TRAVEL AND MISCELLANEOUS EXPENSES

20 For an additional amount for "Travel and miscellaneous
21 expenses", \$500,000.

22 ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES COURTS

23 For an additional amount for "Administrative Office of
24 the United States Courts", \$15,000.

1 RELATED AGENCIES

2 OFFICE OF EDUCATION

3 CIVIL RIGHTS EDUCATION

4 For an additional amount for "Civil Rights Education",
5 including not to exceed \$250,000 for salaries and expenses,
6 \$5,000,000.

7 CHAPTER XI

8 DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

9 COAST GUARD

10 RETIRED PAY

11 For an additional amount for "Retired pay", \$1,250,-
12 000.

13 RELATED AGENCY

14 WASHINGTON METROPOLITAN AREA TRANSIT AUTHORITY

15 FEDERAL CONTRIBUTION

16 For an additional amount for "Federal contribution",
17 to enable the Department of Transportation to pay the
18 Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority an addi-
19 tional contribution for the rail rapid transit system, as au-
20 thorized by the National Capital Transportation Act of 1969,
21 (Public Law 91-143), \$82,939,000, to remain available
22 until expended.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

CHAPTER XII

TREASURY DEPARTMENT

BUREAU OF THE PUBLIC DEBT

ADMINISTERING THE PUBLIC DEBT

For an additional amount for "Administering the public debt", \$3,250,000.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

(Out of Postal Fund)

TRANSPORTATION

For an additional amount for "Transportation", \$10,700,000.

RELATED AGENCIES

TAX COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", \$83,000.

CHAPTER XIII

CLAIMS AND JUDGMENTS

For payment of claims settled and determined by departments and agencies in accord with law and judgments rendered against the United States by the United States Court of Claims and United States district courts, as set forth in House Document Numbered 91-315, Ninety-first Congress, \$6,591,406, together with such amounts as may be necessary to pay interest (as and when specified in such

1 judgments or provided by law) and such additional sums
 2 due to increases in rates of exchange as may be necessary to
 3 pay claims in foreign currency: *Provided*, That no judgment
 4 herein appropriated for shall be paid until it shall become
 5 final and conclusive against the United States by failure of
 6 the parties to appeal or otherwise: *Provided further*, That
 7 unless otherwise specifically required by law or by judgment,
 8 payment of interest wherever appropriated for herein shall
 9 not continue for more than thirty days after the date of
 10 approval of the Act.

11 TITLE II

12 INCREASED PAY COSTS

13 For additional amounts for appropriations for the fiscal
 14 year 1970, for increased pay costs authorized by or pursuant
 15 to law, as follows:

16 LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

17 HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

18 "Office of the Parliamentarian", \$10,865;

19 "Compilation of precedents of House of Representa-
 20 tives", \$1,330;

21 "Office of the Chaplain", \$1,805;

22 "Office of the Clerk", \$100,000;

23 "Office of the Sergeant at Arms", \$250,000;

24 "Office of the Doorkeeper", \$120,000;

25 "Office of the Postmaster", \$62,900;

1 “Committee employees”, \$700,000;

2 Special and minority employees:

3 “House Democratic steering committee”, \$1,310:

4 “House Republican conference”, \$1,310;

5 “Majority leader”, \$8,135;

6 “Minority leader”, \$7,265;

7 “Majority whip”, \$5,525;

8 “Minority whip”, \$5,525;

9 “Official reporters of debates”, \$32,605;

10 “Official reporters to committees”, \$32,370;

11 “Committee on Appropriations”, \$89,445;

12 “Office of the legislative counsel”, \$23,400;

13 “Members’ clerk hire”, \$850,000;

14 Contingent expenses of the House:

15 “Government contributions”, \$760,000, and in
16 addition such amount as may be necessary may be
17 transferred from the appropriation for “miscellane-
18 ous items”;

19 “Speaker’s automobile”, \$1,500;

20 “Majority leader’s automobile”, \$1,500;

21 “Minority leader’s automobile”, \$1,500;

22 Joint items:

23 Contingent expenses of the Senate:

24 “Joint Economic Committee”, \$44,490

1 “Joint Committee on Atomic Energy”,
2 \$32,460;

3 “Joint Committee on Printing”, \$15,175;

4 Contingent expenses of the House:

5 “Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Tax-
6 ation”, \$10,065;

7 “Joint Committee on Defense Production”,
8 \$10,850;

9 ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

10 Office of the Architect of the Capitol: “Salaries”,
11 \$56,000.

12 Capitol buildings and grounds:

13 “Capitol buildings”, \$55,500;

14 “Capitol grounds”, \$28,200;

15 “House office buildings”, \$120,000;

16 “Capitol power plant”, \$20,800;

17 Library buildings and grounds: “Structural and me-
18 chanical care”, \$10,000.

19 BOTANIC GARDEN

20 “Salaries and expenses”, \$24,000;

21 LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

22 “Salaries and expenses”, \$1,313,500;

23 Copyright Office: “Salaries and expenses”, \$274,000

24 Legislative Reference Service: “Salaries and expenses”,
25 \$414,000;

1 Distribution of catalog cards: "Salaries and expenses",
 2 \$159,000, and in addition the reserve fund of \$200,000
 3 under this head, fiscal year 1970, may be used for increased
 4 pay costs;

5 Books for the blind and physically handicapped: "Sal-
 6 aries and expenses", \$33,000;

7 Organizing and microfilming the papers of the Presi-
 8 dents: "Salaries and expenses", \$13,200;

9 "Collection and distribution of library materials (special
 10 foreign currency program)", \$14,000;

11 GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

12 Office of Superintendent of Documents: "Salaries and
 13 expenses", \$395,400, and in addition the reserve fund of
 14 \$200,000 under this head, fiscal year 1970, may be used
 15 for pay costs;

16 GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

17 "Salaries and expenses", \$5,142,000;

18 THE JUDICIARY

19 SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

20 "Salaries", \$194,000;

21 "Care of the building and grounds", \$21,700;

22 COURT OF CUSTOMS AND PATENT APPEALS

23 "Salaries and expenses", \$22,000;

24 CUSTOMS COURT

25 "Salaries and expenses", \$128,500;

COURTS OF APPEALS, DISTRICT COURTS, AND OTHER
JUDICIAL SERVICES

“Salaries of supporting personnel”, \$4,370,000;

“Administrative Office of the United States Courts”,
\$190,000, of which \$20,000 shall be derived by transfer
from the appropriation for “Expenses of referees”;

“Expenses of referees”, \$608,000;

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

The White House Office: “Salaries and expenses”,
\$310,000;

“Operating expenses, Executive Mansion”, \$48,000;

BUREAU OF THE BUDGET

“Salaries and expenses”, \$491,000;

COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS

“Salaries and expenses”, \$50,000;

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE COUNCIL

“Salaries and expenses”, \$49,000;

OFFICE OF EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS

“Salaries and expenses”, \$290,000;

SPECIAL REPRESENTATIVE FOR TRADE NEGOTIATIONS

“Salaries and expenses”, \$51,000;

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

PEACE CORPS

“Salaries and expenses”: (Increase of \$1,651,000 in
the limitation on administrative expenses) ;

1 FOREIGN ASSISTANCE: ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE

2 "Administrative expenses", \$3,200,000, to be derived
3 by transfer from appropriations for "Economic assistance",
4 fiscal year 1970;

5 "Administrative and other expenses": \$200,000, to be
6 derived by transfer from appropriations for "Economic as-
7 sistance", fiscal year 1970;

8 DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

9 AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH SERVICE

10 "Salaries and expenses", for "Research", \$8,381,000,
11 and for "Plant and animal disease and pest control",
12 \$5,119,000;

13 COOPERATIVE STATE RESEARCH SERVICE

14 "Payments and expenses", \$130,000;

15 EXTENSION SERVICE

16 "Cooperative extension work, payments and expenses",
17 for "Federal Extension Service", \$250,000;

18 FARMER COOPERATIVE SERVICE

19 "Salaries and expenses", \$131,000;

20 SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

21 "Conservation operations", \$9,450,000;

22 "River basin surveys and investigations", \$652,000, to
23 remain available until expended;

24 "Watershed planning", \$491,000, to remain available
25 until expended;

1 “Watershed works of improvement”, \$2,159,000, to re-
2 main available until expended;

3 “Flood prevention”, \$815,000, to remain available
4 until expended;

5 “Great plains conservation program”, \$342,000, to re-
6 main available until expended;

7 “Resource conservation and development”, \$573,000,
8 to remain available until expended;

9 ECONOMIC RESEARCH SERVICE

10 “Salaries and expenses”, \$1,142,000;

11 STATISTICAL REPORTING SERVICE

12 “Salaries and expenses”, \$1,116,000;

13 CONSUMER AND MARKETING SERVICE

14 “Consumer protective, marketing, and regulatory pro-
15 grams”, \$5,250,000;

16 FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL SERVICE

17 “Salaries and expenses”, \$600,000;

18 COMMODITY EXCHANGE AUTHORITY

19 “Salaries and expenses”, \$170,000;

20 AGRICULTURAL STABILIZATION AND CONSERVATION

21 SERVICE

22 “Expenses, Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation
23 Service”, \$7,899,000, of which \$600,000 shall be derived
24 by transfer from the appropriation for “Conservation re-

1 serve program", fiscal year 1970, and \$1,299,000 from the
2 Commodity Credit Corporation Fund;

3 OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

4 "Salaries and expenses", \$1,022,000;

5 PACKERS AND STOCKYARDS ADMINISTRATION

6 "Salaries and expenses", \$154,000;

7 OFFICE OF THE GENERAL COUNSEL

8 "Salaries and expenses", \$427,000;

9 OFFICE OF INFORMATION

10 "Salaries and expenses", \$150,000;

11 NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL LIBRARY

12 "Salaries and expenses", \$175,000;

13 OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT SERVICES

14 "Salaries and expenses", \$237,000;

15 GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

16 "Salaries and expenses", \$425,000;

17 RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

18 "Salaries and expenses", \$1,075,000;

19 FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION

20 "Salaries and expenses", \$5,200,000;

21 FOREST SERVICE

22 "Forest protection and utilization", \$10,266,000;

23 FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE CORPORATION

24 "Administrative and operating expenses", \$691,000,

25 which may be paid from premium income;

1 DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

2 GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

3 “Salaries and expenses”, \$604,000;

4 OFFICE OF BUSINESS ECONOMICS

5 “Salaries and expenses,” \$238,000;

6 BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

7 “Salaries and expenses”, \$1,141,000;

8 “Nineteenth decennial census”, \$6,722,000, to remain
9 available until December 31, 1972;10 “1967 economic censuses”, \$282,000, to remain avail-
11 able until December 31, 1970;

12 ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION

13 “Operations and administration”, \$1,121,000;

14 BUSINESS AND DEFENSE SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

15 “Salaries and expenses”, \$505,000;

16 INTERNATIONAL ACTIVITIES

17 “Salaries and expenses”, \$835,000;

18 “Export control”, \$446,000;

19 OFFICE OF FIELD SERVICES

20 “Salaries and expenses”, \$389,000;

21 MINORITY BUSINESS ENTERPRISE

22 “Salaries and expenses”, \$94,000;

23 FOREIGN DIRECT INVESTMENT CONTROL

24 “Salaries and expenses”, \$100,000;

1 ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCE SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

2 "Salaries and expenses", \$8,040,000;

3 "Research and development", \$1,239,000, to remain
4 available until expended;5 "Satellite operations", \$421,000, to remain available un-
6 til expended;

7 PATENT OFFICE

8 "Salaries and expenses", \$3,135,000;

9 NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS

10 "Research and technical services", \$2,187,000;

11 MARITIME ADMINISTRATION

12 "Salaries and expenses", for administrative expenses,
13 \$746,000;

14 "Maritime training", \$204,000;

15 DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—MILITARY

16 MILITARY PERSONNEL

17 "Military personnel, Army", \$538,000,000;

18 "Military personnel, Navy", \$360,000,000;

19 "Military personnel, Marine Corps", \$123,300,000;

20 "Military personnel, Air Force", \$485,000,000;

21 "Reserve personnel, Army", \$22,900,000;

22 "Reserve personnel, Navy", \$6,000,000;

23 "Reserve personnel, Marine Corps", \$4,000,000;

24 "National Guard personnel, Army", \$33,500,000;

25 "National Guard personnel, Air Force", \$10,000,000;

1 RETIRED MILITARY PERSONNEL

2 "Retired pay, Defense", \$25,000,000;

3 OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

4 "Operation and maintenance, Army", \$196,480,000;

5 "Operation and maintenance, Navy", \$157,800,000;

6 "Operation and maintenance, Marine Corps", \$7,000,-

7 000;

8 "Operation and maintenance, Air Force", \$84,200,000;

9 "Operation and maintenance, Defense agencies", \$70,-
10 400,000;

11 "Operation and maintenance, Army National Guard",
12 \$13,800,000;

13 "Operation and maintenance, Air National Guard",
14 \$12,250,000;

15 "Court of Military Appeals", \$70,000;

16 CIVIL DEFENSE

17 "Operation and maintenance", \$850,000;

18 DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

19 DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

20 CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

21 "Operation and maintenance, general", \$6,905,000;

22 "General expenses", \$2,000,000;

23 RYUKYU ISLANDS, ARMY

24 "Administration", \$200,000;

1 U.S. SOLDIERS' HOME

2 "Operation and maintenance", \$296,000;

3 THE PANAMA CANAL

4 CANAL ZONE GOVERNMENT

5 "Operating expenses", \$963,000;

6 PANAMA CANAL COMPANY

7 "Limitation on general and administrative expenses",

8 (Increase of \$605,000 in the limitation on general and ad-

9 ministrative expenses) ;

10 DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND

11 WELFARE

12 CONSUMER PROTECTION AND ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH

13 SERVICE

14 "Food and drug control", \$2,294,000, to be derived by

15 transfer from the appropriation for "Health services research

16 and development", fiscal year 1970;

17 "Air pollution control", \$1,062,000, to be derived by

18 transfer from the appropriation for "Comprehensive health

19 planning and services", fiscal year 1970;

20 "Environmental control", \$757,000, to be derived by

21 transfer from the appropriation for "Regional medical pro-

22 grams", fiscal year 1970;

23 "Office of the Administrator, salaries and expenses",

24 \$354,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation

25 for "National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases",

26 fiscal year 1970;

1 HEALTH SERVICES AND MENTAL HEALTH

2 ADMINISTRATION

3 "Mental health", \$358,000, to be derived by transfer
4 from the appropriation for "National Institute of Allergy and
5 Infectious Diseases", fiscal year 1970;

6 "Saint Elizabeths Hospital", \$2,519,000, to be derived
7 by transfer from the appropriation for "National Institute of
8 Neurological Diseases and Stroke", fiscal year 1970;

9 "Communicable diseases", \$2,446,000, to be derived by
10 transfer from the appropriation for "Maternal and child
11 health and welfare", fiscal year 1970;

12 "Hospital construction", \$208,000, to be derived by
13 transfer from the appropriation for "National Institute of
14 Arthritis and Metabolic Diseases", fiscal year 1970;

15 "Patient care and special health services", \$5,241,000,
16 to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "National
17 Institute of Arthritis and Metabolic Diseases", fiscal year
18 1970;

19 "National health statistics", \$329,000, to be derived by
20 transfer from the appropriation for "National Institute of
21 Arthritis and Metabolic Diseases", fiscal year 1970;

22 "Indian health services", \$4,464,000, to be derived by
23 transfer from the appropriation for "National Institute of
24 General Medical Sciences", fiscal year 1970;

25 "Office of the Administrator, salaries and expenses",

1 \$691,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation
 2 for "National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Stroke",
 3 fiscal year 1970;

4 NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

5 "Office of the Director, Salaries and expenses", \$218,-
 6 000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for
 7 "National Institute of General Medical Sciences", fiscal year
 8 1970;

9 OFFICE OF EDUCATION

10 "School assistance in federally affected areas", \$14,000,
 11 to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Re-
 12 search and training, Office of Education", fiscal year 1970;

13 "Libraries and community services", \$300,000, to be
 14 derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Research
 15 and training, Office of Education", fiscal year 1970;

16 "Salaries and expenses", \$2,528,000, to be derived by
 17 transfer from the appropriation for "Research and training,
 18 Office of Education", fiscal year 1970;

19 SOCIAL AND REHABILITATION SERVICE

20 "Salaries and expenses", \$2,496,000, to be derived by
 21 transfer from the appropriation for "National Institute of
 22 Allergy and Infectious Diseases", fiscal year 1970;

23 "Assistance to refugees in the United States", \$90,000,
 24 to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Na-

1 tional Institute of Neurological Diseases and Stroke”, fiscal
2 year 1970;

3 SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

4 “Limitation on salaries and expenses (trust fund)” (In-
5 crease of \$21,276,000 in the limitation on “Salaries and ex-
6 penses”);

7 SPECIAL INSTITUTIONS

8 “Model Secondary School for the Deaf, salaries and ex-
9 penses”, \$12,000, to be derived by transfer from the appro-
10 priation for “National Institute of Neurological Diseases and
11 Stroke”, fiscal year 1970;

12 “Gallaudet College, salaries and expenses”, \$162,000,
13 to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for “Na-
14 tional Institute of Neurological Diseases and Stroke”, fiscal
15 year 1970;

16 “Howard University, salaries and expenses”, \$664,000,
17 to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for “Com-
18 prehensive health planning and services”, fiscal year 1970;

19 “Freedmen’s Hospital”, \$766,000, to be derived by
20 transfer from the appropriation for “comprehensive health
21 planning and services”, fiscal year 1970;

22 DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT

23 “Office of the Secretary, salaries and expenses”,
24 \$451,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation

1 for "Comprehensive health planning and services", fiscal
2 year 1970;

3 "Office for Civil Rights, salaries and expenses", \$496,-
4 000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for
5 "Comprehensive health planning and services", fiscal year
6 1970;

7 "Office of Community and Field Services, salaries and
8 expenses", \$607,000, to be derived by transfer from the
9 appropriation for "Comprehensive health planning and serv-
10 ices", fiscal year 1970;

11 "Office of the Comptroller, salaries and expenses",
12 \$1,018,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropria-
13 tion for "Comprehensive health planning and services", fiscal
14 year 1970;

15 "Office of the Administrator, salaries and expenses",
16 \$476,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation
17 for "Comprehensive health planning and services", fiscal
18 year 1970;

19 "Surplus property utilization", \$107,000, to be derived
20 by transfer from the appropriation for "Comprehensive
21 health planning and services", fiscal year 1970;

22 "Office of the General Counsel, salaries and expenses",
23 \$337,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation
24 for "Comprehensive health planning and services", fiscal
25 year 1970;

1 DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN
2 DEVELOPMENT

3 RENEWAL AND HOUSING ASSISTANCE

4 "Salaries and expenses", \$2,508,000;

5 METROPOLITAN DEVELOPMENT

6 "Salaries and expenses", \$480,700;

7 MODEL CITIES AND GOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

8 "Salaries and expenses", \$27,600, together with not to
9 exceed \$400,900, to be derived by transfer from the appro-
10 priation for "Model cities programs" fiscal year 1970;

11 FEDERAL INSURANCE ADMINISTRATION

12 "Flood insurance", \$28,500;

13 FAIR HOUSING AND EQUAL OPPORTUNITY

14 "Fair housing and equal opportunity", \$391,400.

15 DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT

16 "General administration", \$559,500;

17 "Regional management and services", \$655,000;

18 "Limitation on administrative expenses, college housing
19 loans" (Increase of \$75,000 in the limitation on administra-
20 tive expenses) ;

21 "Limitation on administrative expenses, public facility
22 loans" (Increase of \$55,000 in the limitation on adminis-
23 trative expenses) ;

24 "Limitation on administrative expenses, revolving fund

1 (liquidating programs) ” (Increase of \$6,700 in the limita-
2 tion on administrative expenses) ;

3 “Limitation on administrative and nonadministrative ex-
4 penses, Federal housing administration” (Increase of \$450,-
5 000 in the limitation on administrative expenses and increase
6 of \$5,175,000 in the limitation on nonadministrative ex-
7 penses) ;

8 DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

9 BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

10 “Management of lands and resources”, \$3,498,000;

11 BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

12 “Education and welfare services”, \$9,799,000;

13 “Resources management”, \$4,378,000;

14 “General administrative expenses”, \$500,000;

15 BUREAU OF OUTDOOR RECREATION

16 “Salaries and expenses”, \$200,000;

17 GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

18 “Surveys, investigations, and research”, \$3,310,000;

19 BUREAU OF MINES

20 “Conservation and development of mineral resources”,
21 \$3,164,000;

22 “Health and safety”, \$1,120,000;

23 “General administrative expenses”, \$152,000;

24 OFFICE OF OIL AND GAS

25 “Salaries and expenses”, \$91,000;

1 BUREAU OF COMMERCIAL FISHERIES

2 “Management and investigations of resources”, \$936,-
3 000;

4 “Federal aid for commercial fisheries research and de-
5 velopment”, \$13,000;

6 “Anadromous and Great Lakes fisheries conservation”,
7 \$11,000;

8 “General administrative expenses”, \$131,000;

9 “Administration of Pribilof Islands”, \$120,000, to be
10 derived from the Pribilof Islands fund;

11 “Limitation on administrative expenses, fisheries loan
12 fund” (Increase of \$25,000 in the limitation on administra-
13 tive expenses) ;

14 BUREAU OF SPORT FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE

15 “Management and investigations of resources”, \$3,363.-
16 000;

17 “General administrative expenses”, \$176,000;

18 “Anadromous and Great Lakes fisheries conservation”,
19 \$17,000;

20 NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

21 “Management and protection”, \$3,359,000;

22 “Maintenance and rehabilitation of physical facilities”,
23 \$1,346,000;

24 “General administrative expenses”, \$263,000;

25 “Preservation of historic properties”, \$40,000;

1 BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

2 "General investigations", \$900,000;

3 "Operation and maintenance", \$1,870,000;

4 "General administrative expenses", \$970,000;

5 BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION

6 "Operation and maintenance", \$800,000;

7 SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

8 "Operation and maintenance", \$155,000;

9 OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR

10 "Salaries and expenses", \$374,000;

11 OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

12 "Salaries and expenses", \$702,000;

13 OFFICE OF WATER RESOURCES RESEARCH

14 "Salaries and expenses", \$52,000;

15 DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

16 LEGAL ACTIVITIES AND GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

17 "Salaries and expenses, general administration", \$634,-
18 000;

19 "Salaries and expenses, general legal activities", \$2,-
20 264,000;

21 "Salaries and expenses, Antitrust Division", \$769,000;

22 "Salaries and expenses, United States attorneys and
23 marshals", \$3,824,000;

24 "Salaries and expenses, Community Relations Service",
25 \$230,000;

1 FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

2 “Salaries and expenses”, \$17,455,000;

3 IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE

4 “Salaries and expenses”, \$7,452,000;

5 FEDERAL PRISON SYSTEM

6 “Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Prisons”, \$5,109,000;

7 BUREAU OF NARCOTICS AND DANGEROUS DRUGS

8 “Salaries and expenses”, \$1,530,000;

9 DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

10 MANPOWER ADMINISTRATION

11 “Manpower development and training activities”, \$145,-
12 000, of which \$100,000 shall be derived by transfer from
13 the appropriation for “Office of Manpower Administrator,
14 salaries and expenses”, fiscal year 1970;

15 “Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training, salaries and
16 expenses”, \$343,000;

17 “Bureau of Employment Security, salaries and ex-
18 penses”, \$1,408,000, to be expended from the Employ-
19 ment Security Administration account in the Unemploy-
20 ment Trust Fund;

21 LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS

22 “Labor-Management Services Administration, salaries
23 and expenses”, \$805,000;

1 WAGE AND LABOR STANDARDS

2 "Wage and Labor Standards Administration, salaries
3 and expenses", \$713,000;

4 "Wage and Hour Division, salaries and expenses",
5 \$1,440,000;

6 BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS

7 "Salaries and expenses", \$1,693,000;

8 BUREAU OF INTERNATIONAL LABOR AFFAIRS

9 "Salaries and expenses", \$130,000;

10 OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR

11 "Salaries and expenses", \$438,000; and, in addition,
12 \$13,000 to be derived from the Employment Security Ad-
13 ministration account, Unemployment Trust Fund;

14 OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

15 "Salaries and expenses", \$515,000; and, in addition,
16 \$36,000 to be derived from the Employment Security Ad-
17 ministration account, Unemployment Trust Fund;

18 OFFICE OF FEDERAL CONTRACT COMPLIANCE AND

19 CIVIL RIGHTS PROGRAM

20 "Salaries and expenses", \$56,000; and, in addition,
21 \$53,000 to be derived from the Employment Security Ad-
22 ministration account, Unemployment Trust Fund;

1 POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

2 (OUT OF THE POSTAL FUND)

3 "Administration and regional operation"; \$10,715,000;

4 "Research, development, and engineering", \$898,000;

5 to remain available until expended;

6 "Operations", \$261,956,000;

7 "Supplies and services", \$215,000;

8 DEPARTMENT OF STATE

9 ADMINISTRATION OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS

10 "Salaries and expenses," \$13,400,000;

11 "Acquisition, operation, and maintenance of buildings
12 abroad," \$177,000, to remain available until expended;

13 INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND CONFERENCES

14 "Missions to international organizations," \$340,000;

15 INTERNATIONAL COMMISSIONS

16 INTERNATIONAL BOUNDARY AND WATER COMMISSION,

17 UNITED STATES AND MEXICO

18 "Salaries and expenses," \$81,000;

19 "Operation and maintenance," \$175,000;

20 "American sections, international commissions," \$42,-
21 000;

22 "International fisheries commissions," \$56,000;

1 EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE

2 "Mutual educational and cultural exchange activities,"
3 \$700,000;

4 OTHER

5 "Migration and refugee assistance," \$60,000;

6 DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

7 OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

8 "Salaries and expenses", \$720,000;

9 COAST GUARD

10 "Operating expenses", \$21,675,000;

11 "Reserve training", \$1,000,000;

12 FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION

13 "Operations", \$58,597,000;

14 "Operation and maintenance, National Capital airports",
15 \$400,000;

16 FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION

17 "Office of the Administrator, salaries and expenses",
18 \$132,000 (together with an increase of \$941,000 in the
19 amount to be transferred from the appropriation for "Fed-
20 eral-aid Highways trust fund") ;

21 "Traffic and highway safety", \$600,000;

22 "Motor carrier safety", \$173,000;

23 "Bureau of Public Roads, limitation on general ex-
24 penses" (Increase of \$3,081,000 in the limitation on ad-
25 ministrative expenses to be paid from the appropriation for
26 the "Federal-aid highways trust fund") ;

1 FEDERAL RAILROAD ADMINISTRATION

2 “Office of the Administrator, salaries and expenses”,
3 \$85,000;

4 “Bureau of Railroad Safety”, \$270,000;

5 URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ADMINISTRATION

6 “Salaries and expenses”, \$100,000;

7 SAINT LAWRENCE SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

8 “Limitation on administrative expenses” (Increase of
9 \$52,000 in the limitation on administrative expenses) ;

10 NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD

11 “Salaries and expenses”, \$350,000;

12 TREASURY DEPARTMENT

13 OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

14 “Salaries and expenses”, \$628,000;

15 BUREAU OF ACCOUNTS

16 “Salaries and expenses”, \$400,000;

17 BUREAU OF CUSTOMS

18 “Salaries and expenses”, \$8,830,000;

19 BUREAU OF THE MINT

20 “Salaries and expenses”, \$500,000;

21 BUREAU OF THE PUBLIC DEBT

22 “Administering the public debt”, \$1,444,000;

23 INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE

24 “Salaries and expenses”, \$1,846,000;

25 “Revenue accounting and processing”, \$11,920,000;

26 “Compliance”, \$46,291,000;

1 OFFICE OF THE TREASURER

2 “Salaries and expenses”, \$523,000;

3 UNITED STATES SECRET SERVICE

4 “Salaries and expenses”, \$1,740,000;

5 ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

6 “Operating expenses”, \$5,000,000;

7 GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

8 “Operating expenses, Public Buildings Service”,
9 \$7,222,000;

10 “Operating expenses, Federal Supply Service”,
11 \$4,431,000;

12 “Operating expenses, National Archives and Records
13 Service”, \$1,635,000;

14 “Operating expenses, Transportation and Communica-
15 tions Service”, \$528,000;

16 “Operating expenses, Property Management and Dis-
17 posal Service”, \$796,000;

18 “Salaries and expenses, Office of Administrator”,
19 \$71,000;

20 NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE
21 ADMINISTRATION

22 “Research and program management”, \$38,000,000;

23 VETERANS ADMINISTRATION

24 “Medical and prosthetic research”, \$2,983,000;

25 “Medical administration and miscellaneous operating
26 expenses”, \$955,000;

1 "General operating expenses", \$15,835,000;

2 OTHER INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

3 AMERICAN BATTLE MONUMENTS COMMISSION

4 "Salaries and expenses", \$77,000;

5 CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

6 "Salaries and expenses", \$900,000;

7 CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

8 "Salaries and expenses", \$2,354,000;

9 EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION

10 "Salaries and expenses", \$900,000;

11 EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF THE UNITED STATES

12 "Limitation on administrative expenses" (Increase of
13 \$400,000 in the limitation on administrative expenses) ;

14 FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

15 "Limitation on administrative expenses" (Increase of
16 \$215,000 in the limitation on administrative expenses) ;

17 FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

18 "Salaries and expenses", \$1,700,000;

19 FEDERAL FIELD COMMITTEE FOR DEVELOPMENT

20 PLANNING IN ALASKA

21 "Salaries and expenses", \$21,000;

22 FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

23 "Limitation on administrative and nonadministrative ex-
24 penses, Federal Home Loan Bank Board" (Increase of
25 \$412,000 in the limitation on administrative expenses, and

1 increase of \$325,000 in the limitation on nonadministrative
2 expenses) ;

3 "Limitation on administrative expenses, Federal Savings
4 and Loan Insurance Corporation" (Increase of \$24,000 in
5 the limitation on administrative expenses) ;

6 FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION

7 "Salaries and expenses", \$228,000;

8 FEDERAL MEDIATION AND CONCILIATION SERVICE

9 "Salaries and expenses", \$615,000;

10 FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

11 "Salaries and expenses", \$1,300,000;

12 FEDERAL RADIATION COUNCIL

13 "Salaries and expenses", \$8,000;

14 FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

15 "Salaries and expenses", \$1,000,000;

16 FOREIGN CLAIMS SETTLEMENT COMMISSION

17 "Salaries and expenses", \$56,000;

18 HISTORICAL AND MEMORIAL COMMISSIONS

19 American Revolution Bicentennial Commission:

20 "Salaries and expenses", \$10,000;

21 INTER-AGENCY COMMITTEE ON MEXICAN-AMERICAN

22 AFFAIRS

23 "Salaries and expenses", \$27,000;

1 INTERGOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES

2 ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL
3 RELATIONS

4 "Salaries and expenses", \$45,000;

5 INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

6 "Salaries and expenses", \$1,900,000;

7 NATIONAL CAPITAL PLANNING COMMISSION

8 "Salaries and expenses", \$25,000;

9 NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE

10 HUMANITIES

11 "Salaries and expenses", \$120,000;

12 NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

13 "Salaries and expenses", \$1,642,000;

14 NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

15 "Salaries and expenses", \$127,000;

16 PRESIDENT'S COMMITTEE ON CONSUMER INTERESTS

17 "Salaries and expenses", \$10,000;

18 RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

19 "Limitation on salaries and expenses" (Increase of
20 \$990,000 in the limitation on "Salaries and expenses") ;

21 RENEGOTIATION BOARD

22 "Salaries and expenses", \$110,000;

23 SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

24 "Salaries and expenses", \$1,000,000;

1 SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

2 "Salaries and expenses", \$3,971,000, of which \$3,163,-
3 000 shall be derived by transfer from the "Business loan and
4 investment fund", from the "Disaster loan fund", and from
5 the "Lease guarantees revolving fund";

6 SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

7 "Salaries and expenses", \$1,331,000;

8 "Salaries and expenses, National Gallery of Art,"
9 \$191,000;

10 SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL BOARD

11 "Salaries and expenses", \$57,000;

12 TARIFF COMMISSION

13 "Salaries and expenses", \$239,000;

14 TAX COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

15 "Salaries and expenses", \$140,000;

16 UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY

17 "Salaries and expenses", \$6,883,000;

18 "Special international exhibitions", \$183,000 to remain
19 available until expended;

20 DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

21 (OUT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FUNDS)

22 "General operating expenses", \$1,932,000:

23 "Public safety", \$1,780,000;

24 "Education", \$966,000;

- 1 “Parks and recreation”, \$652,000;
2 “Health and welfare”, \$4,478,000;
3 “Highways and traffic”, \$600,000;
4 “Sanitary engineering”, \$1,096,000.

5 DIVISION OF EXPENSES

6 The sums appropriated in this title for the District of
7 Columbia shall be paid as follows: \$10,332,000 from the gen-
8 eral fund; \$533,000 from the highway fund (regular) ; \$14,-
9 000 from the highway fund (parking) ; \$375,000 from the
10 water fund; and \$250,000 from the sanitary sewage works
11 fund.

12 TITLE III

13 INCREASED PAY COSTS—FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

14 SALARY ACT OF 1970

15 SEC. 301. For costs in the fiscal year 1970 of pay in-
16 creases granted by or pursuant to the Federal Employees
17 Salary Act of 1970 and the Act of December 16, 1967 (81
18 Stat. 649), for any branch of the Federal Government or
19 the municipal government of the District of Columbia, to be
20 available immediately, such amounts as may be necessary,
21 to be determined as hereinafter provided in this title, but
22 no appropriation, fund, limitation, or authorization may be
23 increased pursuant to the provisions of this title in an amount
24 in excess of the cost to such appropriation, fund, limitation,

1 or authorization of increased compensation pursuant to such
2 statutes.

3 SEC. 302. Any officer having administrative control of
4 an appropriation, fund, limitation, or authorization properly
5 chargeable with the costs in the fiscal year 1970 of pay
6 increases granted by or pursuant to the Federal Employees
7 Salary Act of 1970 and the Act of December 16, 1967 (81
8 Stat. 649), is authorized to transfer thereto, from the un-
9 obligated balance of any other appropriation, fund, or au-
10 thorization under his administrative control and expiring for
11 obligation on June 30, 1970, such amounts as may be neces-
12 sary for meeting such costs.

13 SEC. 303. Whenever any officer referred to in section 304
14 of this title shall determine that he has exhausted the possi-
15 bilities of meeting the cost of pay increases through the use
16 of transfers as authorized by said section, he shall certify the
17 additional amount required to meet such costs for each ap-
18 propriation, fund, limitation, or authorization under his ad-
19 ministrative control, and the amounts so certified shall be
20 added to the pertinent appropriation, fund, limitation, or
21 authorization for the fiscal year 1970: *Provided*, That any
22 transfer under the authority of section 302 or any certification
23 made under the authority of this section by an officer in or
24 under the executive branch of the Federal Government shall
25 be valid only when approved by the Director of the Bureau
26 of the Budget.

1 SEC. 304. For the purposes of the transfers and certifi-
2 cations authorized by sections 302 and 303 of this title, the
3 following officers shall be deemed to have administrative con-
4 trol of appropriations, funds, limitations, or authorizations
5 available within their respective organization units—

6 (a) For the legislative branch:

7 The Clerk of the House;

8 The Secretary of the Senate;

9 The Librarian of Congress;

10 The Architect of the Capitol;

11 The Public Printer;

12 The Comptroller General of the United States;

13 The Chief Judge of the United States Tax Court;

14 The chairman of any commission in or under the
15 legislative branch.

16 (b) For the Judiciary:

17 The Administrative Officer of the United States
18 Courts.

19 (c) For the executive branch:

20 The head of each department, agency, or cor-
21 poration in or under the executive branch.

22 (d) For the municipal government of the District of
23 Columbia:

24 The Commissioner of the District of Columbia.

25 SEC. 305. Obligations or expenditures incurred for costs

1 in the fiscal year 1970 of pay increases granted by or pur-
2 suant to the Federal Employees Salary Act of 1970 and the
3 Act of December 16, 1967 (81 Stat. 649), shall not be
4 regarded or reported as violations of section 3679 of the
5 Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665).

6 SEC. 306. (a) Amounts made available by this title
7 shall be derived from the same source as the appropriation,
8 fund, limitation, or authorization to which such amounts
9 are added.

10 (b) Appropriations made by, and transfers made pur-
11 suant to, this title shall be recorded on the books of the
12 Government as of June 30, 1970: *Provided*, That no ap-
13 propriation made by this title shall be warranted, and no
14 transfer authorized by this title shall be made, after Au-
15 gust 15, 1970.

16 (c) A complete report of the appropriations and trans-
17 fers made by or pursuant to this title shall be made, not later
18 than September 15, 1970, by the officers described in section
19 304, to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, who shall
20 compile and transmit to the Congress a consolidated report
21 not later than October 15, 1970.

TITLE IV

LIMITATION ON FISCAL YEAR 1970 BUDGET

OUTLAYS

SEC. 401. (a) Notwithstanding the provisions of title IV of the Second Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1969, expenditures and net lending (budget outlays) of the Federal Government during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, shall not exceed \$197,885,000,000: *Provided*, That whenever action, or inaction, by the Congress on requests for appropriations and other budgetary proposals varies from the President's recommendations with respect to the fiscal year 1970, as reflected in the Budget for 1971 (H. Doc. 91-240, part 1), the Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall report to the President and to the Congress his estimate of the effect of such action or inaction on budget outlays, and the limitation set forth herein shall be correspondingly adjusted: *Provided further*, That the Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall report to the President and to the Congress his estimate of the effect on budget outlays of other actions by the Congress (whether initiated by the President or the Congress) and the limitation set forth herein shall be corre-

1 spondingly adjusted: *Provided further*, That in the event the
2 President shall estimate and determine that total budget out-
3 lays cannot be held within the overall limitation provided
4 herein, he may, after notification in writing to the Congress
5 stating his reasons therefor, adjust the amount by not more
6 than one-half of 1 percent thereof.

7 (b) (1) In the event the President shall estimate and
8 determine that budget outlays during the fiscal year 1970 for
9 the following items (the expenditures for which arise under
10 appropriations or other authority not requiring annual action
11 by the Congress) appearing on page 49 of the Budget for
12 1971, namely:

13 (i) items designated "Social security, medicare,
14 and other social insurance trust funds";

15 (ii) the item "National service life insurance (trust
16 fund)";

17 (iii) the item "Interest"; and

18 (iv) the item "Farm price supports (Commodity
19 Credit Corporation)";

20 will exceed the estimates included for such items in the
21 Budget for 1971, the President may, after notification in
22 writing to the Congress stating his reasons therefor, adjust
23 accordingly the amount of the overall limitation provided
24 in subsection (a).

25 (2) In the event the President shall estimate and deter-

1 mine that receipts (credited against budget outlays) during
2 the fiscal year 1970 derived from:

3 (i) sales of financial assets of programs administered
4 by the Farmers Home Administration, Export-Import
5 Bank, agencies of the Department of Housing and Urban
6 Development, and the Veterans' Administration; and

7 (ii) leases of lands on the Outer Continental Shelf;
8 will be less than the estimates included for such items in the
9 Budget for 1971, the President may, after notification in
10 writing to the Congress stating his reasons therefor, adjust
11 accordingly the amount of the overall limitation provided
12 in subsection (a).

13 (3) The aggregate amount of the adjustments made
14 pursuant to paragraphs (1) and (2) of this subsection shall
15 not exceed \$1,000,000,000.

16 (c) The Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall
17 make a preliminary report (by July 31, 1970) and a final
18 report (by December 31, 1970) to the President and the
19 Congress on the operation of this section.

20 TITLE V

21 LIMITATION ON FISCAL YEAR 1971 BUDGET

22 OUTLAYS

23 SEC. 501. (a) Expenditures and net lending (budget
24 outlays) of the Federal Government during the fiscal year
25 ending June 30, 1971, shall not exceed \$200,771,000,000:

1 *Provided*, That whenever action, or inaction, by the Con-
2 gress on requests for appropriations and other budgetary pro-
3 posals varies from the President's recommendations reflected
4 in the Budget for 1971 (H. Doc. 91-240, part 1), the Di-
5 rector of the Bureau of the Budget shall report to the Presi-
6 dent and to the Congress his estimate of the effect of such
7 action or inaction on budget outlays, and the limitation set
8 forth herein shall be correspondingly adjusted: *Provided*
9 *further*, That the Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall
10 report to the President and to the Congress his estimate of
11 the effect on budget outlays of other actions by the Congress
12 (whether initiated by the President or the Congress) and
13 the limitation set forth herein shall be correspondingly ad-
14 justed, and reports, so far as practicable, shall indicate
15 whether such other actions were initiated by the President
16 or by the Congress.

17 (b) (1) In the event the President shall estimate and
18 determine that budget outlays during the fiscal year 1971
19 for the following items (the expenditures for which arise
20 under appropriations or other authority not requiring an-
21 nual action by the Congress) appearing on page 49 of the
22 Budget for 1971, namely:

23 (i) items designated "Social security, medicare, and
24 other social insurance trust funds";

25 (ii) the item "National service life insurance
26 (trust fund)";

1 (iii) the item "Interest"; and

2 (iv) the item "Farm price supports (Commodity
3 Credit Corporation) "

4 will exceed the estimates included for such items in the
5 Budget for 1971, the President may, after notification in
6 writing to the Congress stating his reasons therefor, adjust
7 accordingly the amount of the overall limitation provided in
8 subsection (a).

9 (2) In the event the President shall estimate and deter-
10 mine that receipts (credited against budget outlays) during
11 the fiscal year 1971 derived from:

12 (i) sales of financial assets of programs adminis-
13 tered by the Farmers Home Administration, Export-
14 Import Bank, agencies of the Department of Housing
15 and Urban Development, and the Veterans' Adminis-
16 tration; and

17 (ii) leases of lands on the Outer Continental
18 Shelf;

19 will be less than the estimates included for such items in
20 the Budget for 1971, the President may, after notification
21 in writing to the Congress stating his reasons therefor, adjust
22 accordingly the amount of the overall limitation provided
23 in subsection (a).

24 (3) The aggregate amount of the adjustments made

1 pursuant to paragraphs (1) and (2) of this subsection shall
2 not exceed \$3,000,000,000.

3 (c) The Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall re-
4 port periodically to the President and to the Congress on the
5 operation of this section. Such reports shall be made at the
6 end of each calendar month during the second session of the
7 Ninety-first Congress and at the end of each calendar quar-
8 ter thereafter.

9 TITLE VI

10 GENERAL PROVISIONS

11 SEC. 601. No part of any appropriation contained in this
12 Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current
13 fiscal year unless expressly so provided therein.

14 SEC. 602. Except where specifically increased or de-
15 creased elsewhere in this Act, the restrictions contained with-
16 in appropriations, or provisions affecting appropriations or
17 other funds, available during the fiscal year 1970, limiting
18 the amounts which may be expended for personal services,
19 or for purposes involving personal services, or amounts which
20 may be transferred between appropriations or authorizations
21 available for or involving such services, are hereby increased
22 to the extent necessary to meet increased pay costs author-
23 ized by or pursuant to law.

24 SEC. 603. None of the funds contained in this Act avail-
25 able to the Inter-American Bank shall be used directly or

- 1 indirectly as grants or loans to officers or members of the
- 2 staff of the Inter-American Bank.

Passed the House of Representatives May 7, 1970.

Attest:

W. PAT JENNINGS,

Clerk.

AN ACT

Making supplemental appropriations for the
fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for
other purposes.

MAY 11, 1970

Read twice and referred to the Committee on
Appropriations

DIGEST of Congressional Proceedings

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(FOR INFORMATION ONLY;
NOT TO BE QUOTED OR CITED)

For actions of June 1, 1970
91st-2nd; No. 88

CONTENTS

Appropriations.....2	Foreign Trade.....8	Public Debt Limit....3
Consumers.....4	Home Loan Bank Board.....7	River Basins.....1
Electric Power.....9	National Park.....5	Supplemental
Exports.....8	Pollution.....6	Appropriations.....7

HIGHLIGHTS. House committee granted rule to bill to increase public debt limit.

HOUSE

1. RIVER BASINS. Received a report from the Secretary of the Army on the Potomac River Basin, Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, Pennsylvania, and the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Public Works. p. H4974

The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee reported, with amendments, H. R. 6715, authorizing the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Narrows unit, Missouri River Basin project, Colorado (H. Rept. No. 91-1132). p. H4974

2. APPROPRIATIONS. The Appropriations Committee reported H. R. 17867, making appropriations for foreign assistance for FY 71 (H. Rept. No. 91-1134). p. H4974

WASHINGTON, D. C.
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
20250

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

3. PUBLIC DEBT LIMIT. The Rules Committee granted a rule for the consideration of H. R. 17802, the bill to increase the public debt limit. p. H4974
4. CONSUMERS. An Interstate and Foreign Commerce subcommittee approved for full committee action H. R. 14931, amended, the proposed Consumer Protection Act. p. D559
5. NATIONAL PARK. Passed over without prejudice H. R. 15012, authorizing a study of the feasibility of establishing a national park to commemorate the opening of the Cherokee Strip. p. H4944
6. POLLUTION. Rep. Ashbrook stated that this country needs a total commitment to solve the pollution crisis. pp. H4964-5

SENATE

7. SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS; HOME LOAN BANK BOARD. Received proposed supplemental appropriation (S. Doc. 91-85) from the President in the amount of \$250 million for the Federal Home Loan Bank Board. pp. S8098-99

An Appropriations subcommittee marked up and voted to report to the full committee H. R. 17399, second supplemental appropriations for FY 70. The full committee is to hold an executive meeting to consider this bill on June 8. (for items of interest to this Department, see Digest No. 68) p. D557

8. EXPORTS; FOREIGN TRADE. Sen. Percy discussed the DISC (Domestic International Sales Corporation) proposal of the Treasury Dept. which would provide tax incentives to increase U.S. exports and retain jobs in this country. pp. S8099-8106
9. ELECTRIC POWER. Sen. Metcalf spoke against rate increases for utility companies stating that the 206 largest concerns averaged a net profit of 15.4 percent. pp. S8115-16

-0-

COMMITTEE HEARINGS ANNOUNCEMENTS;

June 2: Administration of food programs at local levels, S. Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs
Problems of older citizens in rural America, S. Special Committee on Aging
General farm bill, H. Agriculture (exec.)
Revise boundaries of national park, H. Interior and Insular Affairs
Establish National Environmental Data Bank, H. Merchant Marine and Fisheries
Foreign trade, H. Ways and Means
National priorities related to economic policymaking, Joint Economic Committee

-oOo-

DIGEST of Congressional Proceedings

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(FOR INFORMATION ONLY;
NOT TO BE QUOTED OR CITED)

For actions of June 8, 1970
91st-2nd; No. 93

CONTENTS

Agricultural Appropriations.....1	Environment.....18,20	Mink Imports.....14
Appropriations.....1,8	Foreign Trade.....19	National Parks.....12
Catalog.....3	Forest Service.....12	Nutrition.....5
Conservation.....20	Grants.....3	Pollution.....20
Consumer.....11	Irrigation.....13	Public Works.....2
Dams.....13	Land.....16	River Basins.....6
Economy.....4,9	Loans.....3	Tobacco.....7
Elderly.....5	Manpower.....17,18	Trade.....10
Employment.....15,17	Military Construction...1	Water Resources.....16
		Woolen Textiles.....10

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate passed tobacco acreage quota bill. Ready for President.
Senate committee voted to report second supplemental appropriation bill.
Rep. Mahon urged study of report on agricultural appropriations bill.

HOUSE

1. APPROPRIATIONS. Rep. Mahon urged study of the report on the agricultural appropriations bill prior to the bill's consideration. p. H5185
The Appropriations Committee reported H. R. 17970, the military construction appropriations bill for FY 71 (H. Rept. No. 91-1163).
p. H5246
2. PUBLIC WORKS. Passed with amendment H. R. 15712, extending the authorizations for titles I through IV of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 through FY 71. pp. H5185-201

3. LOANS; GRANTS. Rep. Roth stated that "many of our tax dollars are being wasted by needless duplication and overlapping of Federal assistance programs" and inserted the functional index of the latest edition of the "Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance". pp. H5217-29
4. ECONOMY. Rep. Patman discussed the state of the economy and inserted a statement on the economy by Tom Boggs and letters from citizens regarding the impact of high interest rates. pp. H5232-3, H5237-9
5. NUTRITION. Rep. Perkins inserted an article about a program for feeding the elderly at schools. pp. H5240-1
6. RIVER BASINS. Received a report from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior on the Minot extension, Garrison diversion unit, Missouri River Basin project (H. Doc. No. 91-347); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. p. H5246

SENATE

7. TOBACCO. Passed without amendment H. R. 14306 to permit farm operators with certain tobacco acreage quotas to lease all or part of such quotas under certain conditions. This bill now goes to the President. p. S8491
8. APPROPRIATIONS. Committee on Appropriations in Executive session ordered favorably reported with amendments (but did not actually report) H. R. 17399, second supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1970. p. D590
9. ECONOMY. Sen. Percy blamed past budget deficits for current economic problems and expressed his dismay over the 1970 budget deficit. pp. S8501-05
10. TRADE; WOOLEN TEXTILES. Sen. Thurmond discussed the danger of Japanese imports to the domestic woolen industry and urged passage of legislation to restrict foreign textile imports. pp. S8505-07
11. CONSUMER. Sen. Yarborough inserted a magazine article which discusses the career of Rep. Eckhardt and details the consumer protection legislation that he has introduced. pp. S8525-31
12. NATIONAL PARKS; FOREST SERVICE. Sen. Hansen inserted a newspaper article "How To Wreck A National Park" which reports the dangers of over-use of our national parks by tourists loaded with camping and boating paraphernalia and suggests alternatives to preserve the natural quality of the parks. pp. S8531-32
13. IRRIGATION; DAMS. Sen. Dole inserted the remarks of Commissioner Armstrong, Bureau of Reclamation, at the dedication of the Glen Elder Dam. pp. S8534-36

DIGEST of Congressional Proceedings

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(FOR INFORMATION ONLY;
NOT TO BE QUOTED OR CITED)

For actions of June 9, 1970
91st-2nd; No. 94

CONTENTS

Agricultural Appropriations.....1	Housing.....15	Milk Imports.....21
Appropriations.....1,7	Hunger.....11	Mink Imports.....22
Building.....19	Inflation.....10	Population.....23,27
Clean Air.....3	Information.....18	Property.....19
Conservation.....8	Irrigation.....8	Public Works.....26
Economy.....5,10	Lists.....18	Research.....23
Electrification.....9,24	Loans.....2,4,9	River Basin.....13
Environment.....3,12	Meat Imports.....17	Social Security.....6
Forests.....14,20	Military	Solid Waste.....2
Green Revolution.....11	Construction.....1	Taxation.....16,25
		Veterans.....6
		Water Pollution.....13

HIGHLIGHTS: House passed agricultural appropriation bill; rejected Findley farm subsidy limitation amendment.
House subcommittee approved bill to increase limitations on certain loans.
Rep. Ichord introduced and discussed bill to aid rural development in counties located in national forests. Sen. Dole inserted Campbell's environmental challenge speech.

HOUSE

APPROPRIATIONS. Passed with amendments H. R. 17923, the agricultural appropriations bill for FY 71. pp. H5259-93

Agreed to: Smith, Iowa, amendment adding \$44 million in funds available for the rural water and sewer program; pp. H5291-3

Conte amendment striking out a provision clarifying the bill's relationship to other pending general farm legislation awaiting action this session. p. H5293

Rejected: Obey amendment seeking to add \$1.5 million for research in nonchemical means of controlling pests; pp. H5286-8

Hathaway amendment seeking to add \$100,000 for the soil and water research facility at Orono, Maine; pp. H5288-9

Findley amendment limiting farm subsidy payments. pp. H5289-91

Rep. Kleppe commended the Appropriations Committee for its early report of the agricultural appropriations bill. p. H5332

The Rules Committee granted a rule waiving points of order against H. R. 17970, the military construction appropriations bill. p. H5338

2. SOLID WASTE; LOANS. The Rules Committee granted a rule providing for consideration of H. R. 11833, providing financial assistance for the construction of solid waste disposal facilities. p. H5338
3. ENVIRONMENT. The Rules Committee granted a rule providing for consideration of H. R. 17255, amending the Clean Air Act to provide for a more effective program to improve the quality of the Nation's air. p. H5338
Rep. Leggett inserted an article illustrating the results of failure to recognize the possibility of rendering the environment incapable of supporting human life. p. H5336
4. LOANS. An Agriculture Committee subcommittee approved for full committee action H. R. 11547, amended, to amend the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961, as amended, to increase the limitation on certain loans. p. D599
5. ECONOMY. Rep. Monagan urged that "firm steps be taken to bring the economy under control". pp. H5295-6
Rep. Gonzalez discussed the need to give the President standby powers to impose controls on wages and prices. pp. H5324-6
Rep. Patman stated we must have a rollback of high interest rates and cited the example of Penn Central's recent inability to sell debentures. He also inserted a recent Lou Harris poll. pp. H5329-31
6. SOCIAL SECURITY; VETERANS. Rep. Podell discussed a recent bill designed to correct inequities when veterans begin to draw social security benefits. pp. H5328-9

SENATE

7. APPROPRIATIONS. Committee on Appropriations reported with amendments, H. R. 17399, second supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1970 (S. Rept. No. 91-917). An additional \$172,000 for FS to repair the Summit Lake Dam in the Monongahela National Forest was recommended (table attached to Digest) p. S856
8. IRRIGATION; CONSERVATION. Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs reported without amendment H. R. 9854, the East Greenacres, Rathdrum Prairie Project (S. Rept. No. 91-920). p. S8575
9. ELECTRIFICATION. Received letters from the Acting Administrator, REA, relating to loans to Central Iowa Power Corp., and the Corn Belt Power Cooperative, with accompanying reports. p. S8574

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

House and Senate Appropriations Committee action on
the 1970 Second Supplemental Appropriations Bill

Agency	Budget Estimate	House Bill	Senate Bill
Agricultural Research Service:			
Salaries and expenses	\$13,661,000	\$13,500,000	\$13,500,000
Cooperative State Research Service	138,000	130,000	130,000
Extension Service	<u>a/</u> 847,000	847,000	<u>c/</u> 675,000
Farmer Cooperative Service	131,000	131,000	131,000
Soil Conservation Service:			
Conservation operations	9,450,000	9,450,000	9,450,000
Watershed planning	491,000	491,000	491,000
Per basin surveys and investigations	652,000	652,000	652,000
Watershed works of improvement	2,159,000	2,159,000	2,159,000
Flood prevention	815,000	815,000	815,000
Great Plains conservation program	342,000	342,000	342,000
Resource conservation and development	573,000	573,000	573,000
Total, Soil Conservation Service	14,482,000	14,482,000	14,482,000
Economic Research Service	1,142,000	1,142,000	1,142,000
Statistical Reporting Service	1,116,000	1,116,000	1,116,000
Consumer and Marketing Service - Consumer protec- tive, marketing and regulatory programs	6,286,000	5,250,000	5,250,000
Foreign Agricultural Service	630,000	600,000	600,000
Commodity Exchange Authority	170,000	170,000	170,000
Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service: Expenses, ASCS:			
Direct appropriation	6,090,000	6,000,000	6,000,000
Transfer from:			
Conservation reserve program	600,000	600,000	600,000
CCC Fund	1,299,000	1,299,000	1,299,000
Total, ASCS	7,989,000	7,899,000	7,899,000
Federal Crop Insurance Corporation (payable from premium income)	691,000	691,000	691,000
Rural Electrification Administration	1,075,000	1,075,000	1,075,000
Farmers Home Administration	5,365,000	5,200,000	5,200,000
Office of the Inspector General	1,022,000	1,022,000	1,022,000
Packers and Stockyards Administration	154,000	154,000	154,000
Office of the General Counsel	427,000	427,000	427,000
Office of Information	150,000	150,000	150,000
National Agricultural Library	175,000	175,000	175,000
Office of Management Services	237,000	237,000	237,000
General Administration	438,000	425,000	425,000
Forest Service	<u>b/</u> 31,266,000	31,266,000	<u>d/</u> 31,438,000
TOTAL, SUPPLEMENTAL REQUEST, USDA	87,592,000	86,089,000	86,089,000

a/ Includes direct appropriation of \$250,000 for pay costs and authorization for transfer of \$597,000 from the appropriation "Payments to States and Puerto Rico" for Federal contribution to the retirement fund for State extension personnel.

- b/ Includes \$10,266,000 for pay costs and \$21,000,000 program supplemental for fighting forest fires.
- c/ Includes direct appropriation of \$250,000 for pay costs and authorization for transfer of \$425,000 from the appropriation "Payments to States and Puerto Rico" for Federal contribution to the retirement fund for State extension personnel.
- d/ Includes \$10,266,000 for pay costs, \$21,000,000 program supplemental for fighting forest fires, and \$172,000 for repair of the Summit Lake Dam on the Monongahela National Forest.

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1970

JUNE 8, 1970.—Ordered to be printed
Filed under the authority of the order of the Senate of February 7, 1969

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, from the Committee on Appropriations,
submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany H.R. 17399]

The Committee on Appropriations, to which was referred the bill (H.R. 17399) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes, reports the same to the Senate with various amendments and presents herewith information relative to the changes recommended:

Amount of budget estimates to Senate.....	¹ \$6, 580, 171, 902
Bill as passed by the House.....	5, 764, 115, 791
Increases over House bill recommended by Senate committee.....	689, 648, 292
Decreases under budget estimate recommended by Senate committee (net).....	126, 407, 819
Total Senate committee bill as reported.....	6, 453, 764, 083

¹ Includes \$662,098,771 submitted to Senate and not considered by House.

GENERAL STATEMENT

The grand total of new obligational authority recommended by the committee in this bill is \$6,453,764,083. This is a reduction under the budget estimates of \$126,407,819. Although the increase in this bill over the amount of the bill as it passed the House is \$689,648,292, it

is important to make clear that subsequent to the passage of the bill by the House of Representatives supplemental budget estimates were submitted to the Senate. A total of \$662,098,771 was considered by the Senate committee and not considered by the House. Some of the major increases which the committee made in the House bill are as follows:

\$250 million to finance the Foreign Military Credit Sales Act in the event it becomes law;

\$157,816,600 has been added for payment to the civil service retirement and disability fund;

\$50,000,000 has been included for the summer job program under the Department of Labor;

\$8,703,078 has been added for hospital construction;

\$150 million which was submitted in Senate Document 91-83, has been included for emergency school assistance under the Office of Education; and

\$41,020,000 has been restored for necessary pay increase costs for the Department of Defense.

In addition, items for the Senate in excess of \$4.6 million, which were not considered by the House, have been included in the bill. The above items account for over \$662 million of the total increase made by the committee.

Of the total \$6.453 billion in the bill, \$4.3 billion is to finance increased pay costs.

Details with respect to all of these items are explained in the narrative which follows and the tabulations at the conclusion of the report. The estimates considered by the House of Representatives were included in House Documents 91-272, 273, 288, 293, 306, 311, 315, and 322. In addition to these documents, the Senate committee considered estimates submitted in Senate Documents 91-67, 82, 83, 84, 86 and —.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL

SUMMARY

Chapter No.	Department or activity	Budget estimate	Recommended in House bill	Amount recommended by Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (-), Senate bill compared with—	
					Budget estimate	House bill
I	TITLE I—GENERAL SUPPLEMENTALS					
	Agriculture:					
II	By transfer.....	(\$597,000)	(\$597,000)	(\$425,000)	(-\$172,000)	(-\$172,000)
	Defense:					
III	New budget (obligational) authority.....	99,000,000	99,000,000	99,000,000		
	District of Columbia:					
	Federal funds: New budget (obligational) authority.....	7,124,000	1,293,000	5,335,000	-1,789,000	+4,042,000
	District of Columbia funds:					
	New budget (obligational) authority.....	(21,466,000)	(4,078,475)	(13,100,910)	(-8,365,090)	(+9,022,435)
	Foreign Operations:					
IV	New budget (obligational authority).....	480,880,000	205,880,000	455,880,000	-25,000,000	+250,000,000
	Limitation on administrative expenses.....	(349,000)			(-349,000)	

See footnotes at end of table.

**COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS
RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL—Continued**

SUMMARY

Chapter No.	Department or activity	Budget estimate	Recommended in House bill	Amount recommended by Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (—), Senate bill compared with —	
					Budget estimate	House bill
V	TITLE I—GENERAL SUPPLEMENTALS—Continued					
	Independent offices—Housing and Urban Development:					
	New budget (obligational) authority:					
	1969.....	\$13,616,000	\$13,616,000	\$13,616,000		
	1970.....	984,198,600	797,110,000	955,830,600	—\$28,368,000	+\$158,720,600
	Total.....	997,814,600	810,726,000	969,446,600	—28,368,000	+158,720,600
VI	<i>New annual contract authorizations, increase in limitations</i>	(55,500,000)	(75,000,000)	(75,000,000)	(+19,500,000)	
	Interior: New budget (obligational) authority.....	56,015,000	55,715,000	56,037,000	+22,000	+322,000
	Labor—Health, Education, and Welfare:					
	New budget (obligational) authority.....	406,980,000	204,597,000	415,630,078	+8,650,078	+211,033,078
VII	<i>By transfer</i>	(43,000)	(43,000)	(43,000)		
	<i>Limitation on administrative expenses</i>	(10,000,000)	(10,000,000)	(10,000,000)		

VIII	Legislative branch.....	1, 131, 555	731, 555	731, 555	-400, 000	-----
	By transfer.....			(345, 000)	(+345, 000)	-----
IX	Public Works (By transfer).....	(6, 563, 000)	(6, 563, 000)	(6, 563, 000)		-----
X	State, Justice, Commerce, and Judiciary: New budget (obligational) authority:					-----
	1969.....	300, 000	300, 000	300, 000		-----
	1970.....	28, 776, 500	21, 330, 000	22, 825, 000	-5, 951, 500	+1, 495, 000
	Total.....	29, 076, 500	21, 630, 000	23, 125, 000	-5, 951, 500	+1, 495, 000
XI	Transportation: New budget (obligational) authority.....					-----
XII	Treasury-Post Office: New budget (obligational) authority.....	84, 189, 000	84, 189, 000	83, 939, 000	-250, 000	-250, 000
XIII	Claims and judgments.....	15, 703, 000	14, 033, 000	15, 567, 000	-136, 000	+1, 534, 000
	Total, title I—General supplementals:	23, 478, 461	6, 591, 406	23, 478, 461		+16, 887, 055
	New budget (obligational) authority:					-----
	1969.....	13, 916, 000	13, 916, 000	13, 916, 000		-----
	1970.....	2, 187, 476, 116	1, 490, 469, 961	2, 134, 253, 694	-53, 222, 422	+643, 783, 733
	Total.....	2, 201, 392, 116	1, 504, 385, 961	2, 148, 169, 694	-53, 222, 422	+643, 783, 733
	New annual contract authorizations, increase in limitations.....	(55, 500, 000)	(75, 000, 000)	(75, 000, 000)	(+19, 500, 000)	-----
	By transfer.....	(7, 203, 000)	(7, 203, 000)	(7, 376, 000)	(+173, 000)	(+173, 000)
	Limitation on administrative expenses.....	(10, 349, 000)	(10, 000, 000)	(10, 000, 000)	(-349, 000)	-----

See footnotes at end of table.

**COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS
RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL—Continued**

SUMMARY

Chapter No.	Department or activity	Budget estimate	Recommended in House bill	Amount recommended by Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (-), Senate bill compared with—	
					Budget estimate	House bill
	TITLES II AND III—INCREASED PAY COSTS					
	Title II, Regular Increased Pay Costs:					
	New budget (obligational) authority-----	\$3,028,779,786	\$2,909,729,830	\$2,955,594,389	-\$73,185,397	+\$45,864,559
	By transfer-----	(42,263,000)	(42,181,900)	(42,223,900)	(-89,100)	(+42,000)
	Limitations on administrative and nonadministrative expenses-----	(37,927,000)	(36,225,700)	(36,280,700)	(-1,646,900)	(+55,000)
	Title III, Pay Costs—Federal Employees Salary Act of 1970 (indefinite)-----	1 1,350,000,000	1 1,350,000,000	1 1,350,000,000		
	Total, titles II and III, increased pay costs:					
	New budget (obligational) authority:					
	Definite-----	3,028,779,786	2,909,729,830	2,955,594,389	-73,185,397	+45,864,559
	Indefinite-----	1 1,350,000,000	1 1,350,000,000	1 1,350,000,000		
	Total-----	4,378,779,786	4,259,729,830	4,305,594,389	-73,185,397	+45,864,559
	By transfer-----	(42,263,000)	(42,181,900)	(42,223,900)	(-89,100)	(+42,000)
	Limitations on administrative and nonadministrative expenses-----	(37,927,000)	(36,225,700)	(36,280,700)	(-1,646,900)	(+55,000)

RECAPITULATION

Grand total, titles I, II, and III:

New budget (obligational) authority:

1969-----	13,916,000	13,916,000	-----	-----
1970:				
Definite-----	5,216,255,902	4,400,199,791	5,089,848,083	-126,407,819
Indefinite-----	11,350,000,000	11,350,000,000	11,350,000,000	-----
Total, 1970-----	6,566,255,902	5,750,199,791	6,439,848,083	+689,648,292
Total, new budget (obligational) authority-----	6,580,171,902	5,764,115,791	6,453,764,083	+689,648,292
New annual contract authorizations, increase in limitations-----	(55,500,000)	(75,000,000)	(75,000,000)	-----
By transfer-----	(49,466,000)	(49,384,900)	(49,599,900)	(+215,000)
Limitations on administrative and nonadministrative expenses-----	(48,276,000)	(46,225,700)	(46,280,700)	(+55,000)

¹ Estimate of cost for the 6 months the 6 percent retroactive pay bill would be in effect during fiscal 1970. Under the bill language, transfers of certain unobligated balances are authorized to help meet the added costs, and some absorptions otherwise are probable. Thus, the aggregate additional appropriation under this provision may actually be less

than \$1,340,000,000. Note.—In terms of the February budget aggregates for 1970, the net additional estimated amount is \$1,175,000,000, after taking account of the \$175,000,000 allowance in the February budget total to a postal pay raise.

TITLE I

CHAPTER I

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

EXTENSION SERVICE

PAYMENTS AND EXPENSES, RETIREMENT AND EMPLOYEE COMPENSATION COSTS

1970 Appropriations to date	\$131,484,000
Supplemental estimate (H. Doc. 91-272)	¹ (597,000)
House allowance	¹ (597,000)
Committee recommendation	¹ (425,000)

¹ To be derived by transfer for "Payments to States and Puerto Rico, fiscal year 1970."

The committee recommends \$425,000 of supplemental funds, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation item, "payments to States and Puerto Rico." This is the maximum amount currently estimated to be needed to meet the mandatory Federal contribution to the retirement fund for State extension personnel. The amount provided in the fiscal year 1970 appropriation bill for this purpose did not include sufficient funds for increased retirement costs resulting from additional professional workers to promote 4-H type programs in cities, pay comparability increases in certain States, and Public Law 91-93, which increased the Federal contribution from 6.5 percent to 7 percent for the last half of fiscal year 1970.

The committee does not favor meeting these costs by withdrawing funds already allocated to the States under formula and expects that future needs of this nature will be met from appropriated funds.

CHAPTER II

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—MILITARY

RETIRED PAY, DEFENSE

1970 appropriation	\$2,735,000,000
Supplemental estimate (H. Doc. 91-272)	99,000,000
House allowance	99,000,000
Committee recommendation	99,000,000

The committee recommends concurrence with the House allowance of \$99 million, the full amount of the budget estimate. Of this amount, \$95 million is related to cost-of-living increases as measured by the consumer price index. The law provides for an automatic increase in payments to retired personnel whenever the cost of living increases by 3 percent and continues at or above that level for 3 consecutive months. Under this formula, a 4.3-percent increase (\$77 million) took effect on November 1, 1969, based on the consumer price index of August 1969. An additional 1-percent increase (\$18 million) also took effect on that date, under Public Law 91-179, paralleling the 1 percent "Add-on" granted to civil service retirees. The remaining \$4 million is required to cover net changes in the retired population and rates payable from the numbers contemplated in the original fiscal year 1970 estimate.

An additional \$25 million is provided under title II of this bill to cover pay increases for those military personnel who retired after July 1, 1969, the effective date of a 12.6-percent increase in basic pay scales.

Any funds not utilized revert to the Treasury at the end of the fiscal year.

INCREASED PAY COSTS

Supplemental estimates (total)-----	\$2, 251, 971, 000
House allowances (total)-----	2, 149, 700, 000
Committee recommendations (total)-----	2, 190, 720, 000

The committee recommends a total of \$2,190,720,000 for statutory pay cost increases, an addition of \$41,020,000 over the House allowance and a reduction of \$61,251,000 from the total supplemental estimates (H. Doc. 91-272). In its deliberation, the committee considered the fact that the Department of Defense had previously absorbed \$319,897,000 of the total pay increases; thus, the committee recommendation means that the Department will absorb a total of \$381,148,000, or 14.8 percent of the total fiscal year 1970 pay increase costs.

The committee feels that since the pay raises went into effect under the law last July 1, there remains little flexibility to make reductions during the remaining days of this fiscal year, and it recommends increases over House allowances in the following appropriations and amounts:

Military personnel, Air Force-----	\$17, 500, 000
Operation and maintenance, Army-----	10, 420, 000
Operation and maintenance, Navy-----	8, 300, 000
Operation and maintenance, Defense agencies-----	3, 800, 000
Operation and maintenance, Army National Guard-----	1, 000, 000

Total increase recommended by committee-----	41, 020, 000
--	--------------

CHAPTER III

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

FEDERAL FUNDS

The committee recommends an additional Federal payment to the General Fund in the amount of \$4,042,000. This additional amount will result in a total 1970 Federal payment of \$108,211,000 of the \$110 million authorized and is necessary to finance the increased operating and pay costs included in the committee's recommendation. The committee concurs in the House allowance of \$1,293,000 in Federal loans to the District of Columbia.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FUNDS

A total of \$26,647,910 in District of Columbia funds is recommended. This amount includes \$13,547,000 in pay costs, \$4,332,910 in operating costs, and \$8,768,000 in capital outlay. The increase of \$11,065,435 over the amount allowed by the House is the net result of Senate increases less reductions in House allowances.

FEDERAL PAYMENT TO THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Supplemental estimate (H. Doc. 288)-----	\$4, 877, 000
House allowance-----	0
Supplemental estimate (S. Doc. 82)-----	954, 000
Total request to Senate-----	5, 831, 000
Committee recommendation-----	4, 042, 000

The committee recommends \$4,042,000 additional Federal payment to the "General Fund" account of the District of Columbia Government. This sum is the amount over and above what the District feels

it can absorb internally in defraying the increased costs or the supplemental estimate for the balance of 1970.

LOANS TO THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FOR CAPITAL OUTLAY

Supplemental estimate (H. Doc. 272)-----	\$1, 293, 000
House allowance-----	1, 293, 000
Committee recommendation-----	1, 293, 000

The committee concurs with the House allowance of \$1,293,000 in an additional loan to the District of Columbia for the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FUNDS

GENERAL OPERATING EXPENSES

Supplemental estimate (H. Doc. 288)-----	(\$75, 000)
House allowance-----	(2, 675)
Supplemental estimate (S. Doc. 82)-----	(127, 000)
Total request to Senate-----	(202, 000)
Committee recommendation-----	(174, 675)

The committee recommends a total of \$174,675 for general operating expenses which is \$172,000 over the House allowance and \$27,325 less than the budget request. The committee concurs with the House in recommending \$2,675 and two positions to provide staff support for the Criminal Justice Coordinating Board and the Commissioner's Committee on Crime and Delinquency. The request for an Assistant to the Commissioner for Criminal Justice Programs and supporting staff has been denied. The committee also recommends \$45,000 to rent space for the Court of General Sessions. An additional \$99,000 is recommended to support the Department of Finance and Revenue in its collection activities. Also included is \$28,000 for the school transit subsidy.

PUBLIC SAFETY

Supplemental estimate (H. Doc. 288)-----	(\$4, 712, 000)
House allowance-----	(2, 370, 500)
Supplemental estimate (S. Doc. 82)-----	(2, 180, 000)
Total request to Senate-----	(6, 892, 000)
Committee recommendation-----	(3, 966, 485)

The committee recommends \$3,966,485 for public safety which is an increase of \$1,595,985 over the \$2,370,500 allowed in the House bill. The Senate committee has allowed the 475 police positions requested to bring the force to a total of 5,100 men, together with \$1,223,485 in recruiting and support costs, and \$363,000 in pay costs for the month of June. The 44 supporting civilian positions have been allowed as has an amount necessary to cover that portion of police overtime and the pension and relief fund costs that cannot be absorbed. The \$680,000 requested for the Department of Corrections has also been approved.

The committee is greatly concerned that the Department maintain the highest mental, moral, and physical standards in its recruiting. Information received from many sources, including the policemen's association, indicate that there is a widespread belief that the Department's standard of quality has been drastically curtailed in its present drive to meet recruiting goals. The Chief of Police and the Director of Personnel have testified that this is not the case and that standards have been raised rather than lowered. Certainly there is no reason to recruit or retain even one substandard police officer. Every resource

available to the Department should be employed to see that this is not done.

EDUCATION

Supplemental estimate (H. Doc. 288)-----	(\$2, 500, 000)
House allowance-----	0
Committee recommendation-----	0

The committee concurs with the House in recommending 125 unfunded positions to enable the Federal City College and Washington Technical Institute to proceed with staff recruiting. This is a reduction of 29 from the requested faculty positions at Federal City College but will permit the maintenance of the present faculty-student ratio.

PARKS AND RECREATION

Supplemental estimate (H. Doc. 288)-----	(\$90, 000)
House allowance-----	(47, 300)
Supplemental estimate (S. Doc. 82)-----	(144, 000)
Total request to Senate-----	(234, 000)
Committee recommendation-----	(171, 750)

The committee recommends \$171,750 and 28 positions for the extension of the roving leader program. Of this amount, \$144,000 is for overtime. Funds and positions for a second roving leader director, a second assistant roving leader and two additional senior roving leaders were denied.

HEALTH AND WELFARE

Supplemental estimate (S. Doc. 82)-----	(\$2, 850, 000)
House allowance-----	Not considered
Committee recommendation-----	0

Upon learning of overruns in funds appropriated for public assistance payments, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Deficiencies and Supplementals sent the following telegram to the Commissioner of the District of Columbia:

APRIL 28, 1970.

HON. WALTER E. WASHINGTON,
Commissioner of the District of Columbia,
Executive Office, Washington, D.C.:

I urge immediate implementation of all possible measures to conserve regular 1970 health and welfare appropriation to cover reported deficiency in public assistance and will ask for detailed report of specific action taken, at hearing on supplemental request.

ROBERT C. BYRD, U.S.S.

A request for a supplemental appropriation of \$2,850,000 for overruns in public assistance payments was forwarded to the Senate by the President on May 15. Five days later, on May 20, the District government advised the committee that sufficient funds had been discovered to meet the deficiency and that an additional appropriation would not be necessary.

Information available to the committee indicates that prior to submission of the budget estimate the Department's review of its needs was at best superficial. Such carelessly conceived budget estimates do not service to eliminate the continuing problem of the District's communications with this committee. This matter was covered in some detail in the committee's report accompanying the regular 1970 District of Columbia appropriation bill.

The committee concurs with the answer of the District's Director of Human Resources to the following question addressed to him by the chairman of the Subcommittee on Deficiencies and Supplementals:

Senator BYRD. Does this not tend to cast some question on your requests in future years?

Mr. RUTLEDGE. I would think, Mr. Chairman, that we have to analyze much more carefully our budget and our financial plans in the Department of Human Resources.

I would agree that this experience should be a lesson.

SETTLEMENT OF CLAIMS AND SUITS

Supplemental estimate (S. Doc. 82)-----	(\$20, 000)
House allowance-----	Not considered
Committee recommendation-----	(\$20, 000)

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$20,000 for payment of property damage claims in excess of \$500 and of personal injury claims in excess of \$1,000 approved by the Commissioner.

CAPITAL OUTLAY

Supplemental estimate (H. Doc. 272 and H. Doc. 288)-----	(\$2, 378, 000)
House allowance-----	(1, 658, 000)
Supplemental estimate (S. Doc. 82)-----	(6, 390, 000)
Total request to Senate-----	(8, 768, 000)
Committee recommendation-----	(8, 768, 000)

The committee recommends \$8,768,000 which is \$7,110,000 more than the amount allowed by the House. Included in the committee recommendation is \$4,500,000 for Federal City College for additional space and equipment to support implementation of a third-year program and an increase of 1,000 students. The sum of \$1,890,000 is recommended for the Washington Technical Institute for capital improvements at the Van Ness campus and the Washington National Airport. Also included is \$650,000 for additional court facilities in the Potomac Building and \$70,000 for the renovation of existing court space for the court of general sessions. The committee concurs with the House recommendation of \$1,293,000 in additional funds for the Metropolitan Area Transit Authority, and \$365,000 for the Department of Highways and Traffic Carney Block street lighting.

INCREASED PAY COSTS

The committee recommends \$13,547,000 in pay costs. These are included in title II. The increase of \$2,043,000 over the House allowance represents the difference between the original estimate and a recomputation of the actual amount needed to defray these costs.

CHAPTER IV

FOREIGN OPERATIONS

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE

Foreign Military Credit Sales

1970 appropriations to date-----	none
Supplemental estimate (S. Doc. 91-67)-----	\$275, 000, 000
House allowance-----	not considered
Committee recommendation-----	250, 000, 000

For this item, which was not considered by the House, the committee recommends \$250 million which is \$25 million under the budget estimate. These funds will be used to finance credit sales made directly to foreign countries, to guarantee private financing of such credit sales, and guarantee promissory notes received from such credit sales. The authorization for this appropriation has not been enacted into law. The committee has included language which provides that these funds will only become available upon the enactment of H.R. 15628, or similar legislation.

INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Investment in Inter-American Development Bank

1970 appropriations to date.....	none
Supplemental estimate (H. Doc. 91-272).....	\$205, 880, 000
House allowance.....	205, 880, 000
Committee recommendation.....	205, 880, 000

For the second of two equal installments of the authorized U.S. share of a \$1 billion increase in the callable ordinary capital of the Inter-American Development Bank, the committee concurs with the House and recommends \$205,880,000 the same as the budget estimate. The committee also concurs with the language included by the House which provides that none of the funds appropriated under this title may be used for loans to employees of the bank.

CHAPTER V

INDEPENDENT OFFICES

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

PAYMENT TO CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY FUND

1970 appropriations to date.....	\$73, 000, 600
Supplemental estimate (S. Doc. 91-84).....	157, 816, 600
House allowance.....	not considered
Committee recommendation.....	157, 816, 600

The sum recommended by the committee, which is the same as the estimate, is the first of 30 equal annual payments to cover the additional unfunded liability created by the enactment into law of Public Law 91-177, approved December 30, 1969, and Public Law 91-231, approved April 15, 1970. The former act provides retirement credit to certain VISTA volunteers under certain conditions, where the latter act provides a 6-percent pay increase for Federal employees generally, effective retroactively to December 27, 1969.

COMMISSION ON POPULATION GROWTH AND THE AMERICAN FUTURE

1970 appropriations to date.....	none
Supplemental estimate (H. Doc. 91-273).....	\$1, 433, 000
House allowance.....	965, 000
Committee recommendation.....	965, 000

For the Commission on Population Growth and the American Future, which was created by Public Law 91-233, approved March 16, 1970, the committee recommends \$965,000, the sum allowed by the House but \$468,000 less than the estimate.

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

REAL PROPERTY ACTIVITIES

SITES AND EXPENSES, PUBLIC BUILDING PROJECTS

1970 appropriations to date-----	\$11, 000, 000
Supplemental estimate (S. Doc. 91-67)-----	371, 000
House allowance-----	not considered
Committee recommendation-----	371, 000

To provide funds for the design development and site acquisition for a post office and courthouse building in Aberdeen, Miss., the committee recommends the estimate of \$371,000 contained in Senate Document 91-67.

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

1970 appropriations to date-----	\$68, 348, 000
Supplemental estimate (H. Doc. 91-272)-----	7, 433, 000
House allowance-----	7, 000, 000
Committee recommendation-----	7, 433, 000

For this item, the committee recommends the full amount of the estimate of \$7,433,000, which is \$433,000 over the amount allowed by the House.

VETERANS ADMINISTRATION

COMPENSATION AND PENSIONS

1970 appropriations to date (H. Doc. 91-272)-----	\$5, 041, 355, 000
Supplemental estimate-----	273, 045, 000
House allowance-----	273, 045, 000
Committee recommendation-----	273, 045, 000

The committee recommends \$273,045,000 for compensation and pensions for our Nation's veterans and their survivors. This amount is the same as the budget estimate and the House allowance.

READJUSTMENT BENEFITS

1970 appropriations to date-----	\$742, 200, 000
Supplemental estimate (H. Doc. 91-272 and 91-311)-----	330, 500, 000
House allowance-----	327, 500, 000
Committee recommendation-----	327, 500, 000

For readjustment benefits, the committee concurs with the House and allows \$327,500,000, which is \$3,000,000 less than the estimate.

MEDICAL CARE

1970 appropriations to date-----	\$1, 541, 701, 000
Supplemental estimate (H. Doc. 91-293 and 91-272)-----	106, 500, 000
House allowance-----	113, 500, 000
Committee recommendation-----	113, 500, 000

For medical care of veterans, the committee recommends \$113,500,000, which is \$7 million more than the estimate and the same as the amount allowed by the House.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY AND OFFICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

1970 appropriations to date-----	none
Supplemental estimate (H. Doc. 91-272)-----	\$600, 000
House allowance-----	100, 000
Committee recommendation-----	200 000

The committee recommends the amount of \$200,000 for the Council on Environmental Quality, which was created by Public Law 91-190, approved January 1, 1970, and for the Office of Environmental Quality, which was created by Public Law 91-224, approved April 3, 1970.

The committee allowance is \$100,000 more than the amount recommended by the House, which considered only the \$300,000 estimate for the Council on Environmental Quality contained in House Document 91-272. After action by the House, this estimate was withdrawn and replaced by an estimate of \$600,000 contained in Senate Document 91-67 covering both the Council and Office of Environmental Quality.

The committee allowance is in addition to the \$200,000 already advanced to the Council from the Emergency Fund for the President to initiate studies. In this regard, the committee concurs with the House and does not consider it necessary to reimburse the emergency fund at this late date in the fiscal year.

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

DISASTER RELIEF

1970 appropriations to date	\$170, 000, 000
Supplemental estimate (H. Doc. 91-272)	100, 000, 000
House allowance	75, 000, 000
Committee recommendation	75, 000, 000

The committee concurs with the House and allows \$75 million for disaster relief for the remainder of fiscal year 1970. This amount is \$25 million less than the budget estimate.

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

RENEWAL AND HOUSING ASSISTANCE

LOW RENT PUBLIC HOUSING ANNUAL CONTRIBUTIONS, FISCAL YEAR 1969

Appropriations to date	\$366, 000, 000
Supplemental estimate (H. Doc. 91-272)	13, 616, 000
House allowance	13, 616, 000
Committee recommendation	13, 616, 000

For this item, the committee allows \$13,616,000, the budget estimate and the sum allowed by the House. The sum recommended by the committee is required to meet the Federal Government's commitment to local housing authorities, since the amount appropriated for fiscal year 1969 was not sufficient to meet these obligations.

LOW RENT PUBLIC HOUSING ANNUAL CONTRIBUTIONS, FISCAL YEAR 1970

1970 appropriations to date	\$473, 500, 000
Supplemental estimate (H. Doc. 91-272)	6, 500, 000
House allowance	none
Committee recommendation	none

The committee concurs with the House and does not recommend an appropriation for the fiscal year 1970 annual contributions to low rent public housing since firm figures covering this obligation are not yet available.

COLLEGE HOUSING

1970 appropriations to date-----	(\$6, 500, 000)
Supplemental estimate (H. Doc. 91-272)-----	(5, 500, 000)
House allowance-----	(5, 000, 000)
Committee recommendation-----	(5, 000, 000)

For college housing, the committee concurs with the House and recommends an increase of \$5 million in annual contract authority. The committee is aware that the current fluid interest rate situation makes it nigh impossible to estimate the needs for this program with any degree of precision, consequently it has reduced the estimate by \$500,000.

HOMEOWNERSHIP ASSISTANCE (SEC. 235)

1970 appropriations to date-----	(\$90, 000, 000)
Supplemental estimate (H. Doc. 91-273)-----	(25, 000, 000)
House allowance-----	(35, 000, 000)
Committee recommendation-----	(35, 000, 000)

The committee concurs with the House and recommends \$35 million of contract authority for the homeownership assistance program. This amount is \$10 million more than the budget estimate and should prove sufficient to maintain the momentum this program has attained until new authority is granted in fiscal year 1971.

RENTAL HOUSING ASSISTANCE (SEC. 236)

1970 appropriations to date-----	(\$85, 000, 000)
Supplemental estimate (H. Doc. 91-273)-----	(25, 000, 000)
House allowance-----	(35, 000, 000)
Committee recommendation-----	(35, 000, 000)

For rental housing assistance (Sec. 236), the committee recommends annual contract authority of \$35 million which is \$10 million more than the estimate, but the same as the sum allowed by the House.

CHAPTER VI

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT OF LANDS AND RESOURCES

Appropriation, 1970-----	\$53, 823, 000
Supplemental estimate, 1970 (H. Doc. 91-272)-----	23, 790, 000
House allowance-----	23, 790, 000
Committee recommendation-----	23, 790, 000

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$23,790,000, the same as the budget estimate and the House allowance, to provide the costs of suppression and emergency prevention of fires on or threatening forest range lands of the Bureau of Land Management, and for the emergency rehabilitation of those lands to prevent further damage from weather conditions.

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

RESOURCES MANAGEMENT

Appropriation, 1970-----	\$55, 242, 000
Supplemental estimate, 1970 (H. Doc. 91-272)-----	700, 000
House allowance-----	700, 000
Committee recommendation-----	700, 000

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$700,000 to cover the cost of suppression and emergency prevention of fire on or threatening forest lands on Indian reservations and the emergency rehabilitation of those lands to prevent further damage from weather conditions.

BUREAU OF OUTDOOR RECREATION

LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND

Appropriation, 1970	\$124, 000, 000
Supplemental estimate, 1970 (H. Doc. 91-272)	7, 100, 000
House allowance	7, 100, 000
Committee recommendation	7, 100, 000

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$7,100,000 to be used by the National Park Service to acquire additional land for the Point Reyes National Seashore, Calif. It is desirable that this land be acquired to prevent further subdivision of the area for private purposes and to forestall potential subdivision within the boundaries of the area being considered for acquisition.

OFFICE OF TERRITORIES

ADMINISTRATION OF TERRITORIES

Appropriation, 1970	\$14, 921, 400
Supplemental estimate, 1970 (H. Doc. 91-272)	275, 000
House allowance	275, 000
Committee recommendation	275, 000

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$275,000 to provide electricity to the people of the Manu'a Islands and to centralize administrative offices of the government of American Samoa on the main island of Tutuila. This is the amount of the budget estimate and the House allowance.

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

SURVEYS, INVESTIGATIONS, AND RESEARCH

Appropriation, 1970	\$96, 445, 000
Supplemental estimate, 1970 (S. Doc. 91-67)	300, 000
House allowance	not considered
Committee recommendation	225, 000

The committee recommends appropriation of \$225,000, \$75,000 less than the budget estimate, to provide additional inspection and supervisory staff for oil and gas lease operations on the Outer Continental Shelf in the Gulf of Mexico. The additional staff is required to insure more complete surveillance of field operations to assure compliance with regulations and Outer Continental Shelf orders.

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

MANAGEMENT AND PROTECTION

Appropriation, 1970	\$49, 150, 000
Supplemental estimate, 1970 (H. Doc. 91-272)	850, 000
House allowance	850, 000
Committee recommendation	775, 000

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$775,000, which is \$75,000 under the budget estimate and the House allowance, to pay for the costs of fire suppression and emergency suppression and for rehabilitation of burned areas in the parks.

FOREST SERVICE

FOREST PROTECTION AND UTILIZATION—FOREST LAND MANAGEMENT

Appropriation, 1970-----	\$257, 676, 000
Supplemental estimate, 1970 (H. Doc. 91-272)-----	21, 000, 000
House allowance-----	21, 000, 000
Committee recommendation-----	21, 172, 000

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$21,172,000, which is \$172,000 more than the House allowance and the budget estimate. Of this sum, \$21 million is to pay for the cost of fires which have occurred in national forests and which may be expected to occur before the end of the fiscal year.

The Summit Lake Dam on the Monongahela National Forest is weakened and in need of repair in order adequately to provide water for the city of Richwood as well as the recreation for which the lake was formed. The additional \$172,000 is for this purpose.

NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1970-----	\$15, 790, 000
Supplemental estimate, 1970 (H. Doc. 91-272)-----	2, 000, 000
House allowance-----	2, 000, 000
Committee recommendation-----	2, 000, 000

The committee recommends the appropriation of \$2 million recommended by the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities to provide Federal funds to match private gifts made to the two endowments of the Foundation. This is the same as the budget estimate and the House allowance.

CHAPTER VII

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

MANPOWER ADMINISTRATION

MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING ACTIVITIES

Summer Youth Programs

1970 funds available-----	\$147, 900, 000
Supplemental estimate-----	\$50, 000, 000
House allowance-----	Not considered
Senate allowance-----	\$50, 000, 000

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$50 million, to remain available until September 30, 1970, to provide additional funds for the 1970 summer youth program. This will provide \$35 million for about 80,000 new summer job opportunities for disadvantaged youth and \$15 million for a Neighborhood Youth Corps summer support program to be administered by the Department of Labor in cooperation with the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation of the Department of the Interior, principally in the Nation's 100 largest cities. The administration has reported that the additional funds, representing an increase of \$34,900,000 and 17,100 job opportunities over the 1969 program, can be effectively used in the 3-month summer program.

BUREAU OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEES AND EX-SERVICEMEN

1970 appropriation-----	\$135, 000, 000
Supplemental estimate (H. Doc. 91-272)-----	50, 000, 000
House allowance-----	50, 000, 000
Committee recommendation-----	50, 000, 000

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$50 million, the same as the House allowance and the budget estimate, for mandatory benefit payments which are due to uncontrollable increases in average weekly benefit amounts and number of weeks compensated for unemployment compensation. The amount recommended by the committee will eliminate the need for advancing 1971 funds for payment of 1970 benefits and thus reducing the amount available for payment of 1971 benefits.

TRADE ADJUSTMENT ACTIVITIES

1970 appropriation.....	\$600, 000
Supplemental estimate (S. Doc. 91-67).....	\$2, 330, 000
House allowance.....	Not Considered
Committee recommendation.....	\$2, 330, 000

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$2,330,000, together with such amount as may be necessary to be charged to the subsequent year appropriation for these expenses for any period subsequent to March 31 of the current year. The appropriation will provide for weekly adjustment allowances for workers separated from firms that make products affected by operations under the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 and for certain Federal costs of administering the program. No workers had been certified as eligible for assistance between October 1962, when the act was signed, and November 1969, when three groups of workers were certified by the Tariff Commission. In March 1970, the President authorized groups of workers in two more industries to apply directly to the Department of Labor for certification of eligibility. The funds recommended for appropriation are to meet the costs of these legal claims.

This request was not considered by the House.

LIMITATION ON GRANTS TO STATES FOR UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION AND EMPLOYMENT SERVICE ADMINISTRATION

1970 appropriation.....	\$655, 772, 000
Supplemental estimate (H. Doc. 91-272).....	10, 000, 000
House allowance.....	10, 000, 000
Committee recommendation.....	10, 000, 000

The committee recommends \$10 million, the same as the House allowance and the budget estimate, to be derived from the Unemployment Trust Fund to provide for an increase in the contingency fund to cover costs of administration resulting from increases in the unemployment insurance claims workload. The workload has increased because of an overall increase in the rate of unemployment in the past few months and cannot be absorbed within existing funds.

WAGE AND LABOR STANDARDS ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

1970 appropriation.....	\$12, 050, 000
Supplemental estimate (H. Doc. 91-272).....	37, 000
House allowance.....	37, 000
Committee recommendation.....	37, 000

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$37,000, the same as the House allowance and budget estimate to provide funds to the Longshoremens' and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act Trust Fund

to pay three outstanding disability and death compensation claims that cannot otherwise be satisfied due to the insolvency of the special fund created for this purpose. Pending legislation to amend the act, if approved, will restore the solvency of the fund and eliminate the need for further appropriations in this account.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

FEDERAL CONTRACT COMPLIANCE AND CIVIL RIGHTS PROGRAM

Salaries and expenses	
1970 appropriation-----	\$1, 490, 000
Supplemental estimate (H. Doc. 91-272)-----	160, 000
House allowance-----	107, 000
Committee recommendation-----	107, 000

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$107,000, the amount allowed by the House, and a reduction of \$53,000 from the request, to provide for development of a program of comprehensive planning, programing, policy and procedures to establish agency and contractor compliance and to coordinate activities with other agencies. The committee agrees with the House reduction in the request for additional employees from 26 to 17, and believes that with the reduced number of employees the program to encourage and assist in development of voluntary hometown solutions to discrimination in minority hiring practices can go forward.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

HEALTH SERVICES AND MENTAL HEALTH ADMINISTRATION

HOSPITAL CONSTRUCTION	
1970 appropriation-----	\$172, 200, 000
Supplemental estimate-----	None
House allowance-----	Not considered
Committee recommendation-----	8, 703, 078

The bill includes \$8,703,078 to provide funds for some 35 selected hospital construction projects. These hospitals had based their funding requirements on the assumption that the Hill-Burton hospital construction grant program would be continued at the 1969 level of \$254 million. The 1970 appropriation of \$172 million for hospital construction grants has resulted in a lower level of funds available to these hospitals than they had anticipated. The amount included in this bill is designed to provide relief for those hospitals that are already under contract for construction and who are faced with funding deficits unless relief is provided.

LIST OF 35 PROJECTS UNDER CONSTRUCTION WITH COMMITMENT FROM STATE HILL-BURTON AGENCY, WHICH
ARE AFFECTED BY REDUCED FISCAL APPROPRIATION

State and name of hospital	Location	Amount
New Hampshire: Grafton County Nursing Home	Haverhill	2, 524
Maryland:		
Baltimore City Hospital, "A" Building	Baltimore	43, 218
Dorchester County Public Health Center	Cambridge	16, 731
Total		59, 949
North Carolina: North Carolina Baptist Hospital	Winston-Salem	386, 356
Wisconsin:		
St. Mary's Hospital	Wausau	50, 000
Vernon Memorial Hospital	Viroqua	17, 214
St. Michael's Hospital	Stevens Point	330, 100
Beloit Memorial Hospital	Beloit	1, 020, 575
Victory Memorial Hospital	Stanley	34, 397
Total		1, 452, 286
Indiana:		
St. Mary Mercy Hospital	Gary	250, 443
Union Hospital	Terre Haute	
Kansas:		
St. Francis Hospital	Topeka	288, 496
St. John's Hospital	Salina	68, 328
Mount Carmel Hospital	Pittsburg	273, 312
St. Luke's Hospital	Wellington	129, 064
McPherson County Hospital	McPherson	219, 349
Wyandotte Health Center	Kansas City	146, 233
Northwest Medical Center	Goodland	5, 463
Total		1, 130, 245
Nebraska:		
Mary Lanning Hospital	Hastings	140, 000
St. Elizabeth's Hospital	Lincoln	100, 000
Madonna Nursing Home	do	52, 000
Total		292, 000
Oklahoma:		
Alva General Hospital	Alva	55, 000
Norman Municipal Hospital	Norman	500, 000
Oklahoma City-County Health Department	Oklahoma City	650, 000
Hillcrest Medical Center	Tulsa	1, 250, 000
Newman Memorial Hospital	Shattuck	20, 000
Purcell Municipal Hospital	Purcell	5, 000
Southwestern Memorial Hospital	Weatherford	255, 000
Okfuskee Memorial Hospital	Okemah	30, 000
Deaconess Hospital	Oklahoma City	324, 275
Central State Hospital children's unit	Norman	225, 000
Arkview Hospital	El Reno	600, 000
Cimarron Memorial Hospital	Boise City	15, 000
Total		3, 929, 275
Arkansas:		
St. Vincent's Hospital	Little Rock	200, 000
Baptist Medical Center	do	1, 000, 000
Total		1, 200, 000
Grand total		8, 703, 078

OFFICE OF EDUCATION

EMERGENCY SCHOOL ASSISTANCE

1970 appropriation-----	None
Supplemental budget estimate (S. Doc. 91-83)-----	\$150, 000, 000
House allowance-----	Not considered
Committee recommendation-----	150, 000, 000

The committee recommends \$150 million, the same as the supplemental estimate, to meet the additional costs which will be encountered by about 1,000 school districts which are expected to desegregate by September 1970. The request for these funds was transmitted to the Senate on May 25, 1970, and therefore was not received in time for consideration by the House.

The supplemental request is the first part of the President's announced plans to ask for a total of \$1.5 billion for this purpose over the next 2 years. The \$150 million has been requested as a supplemental in order to make assistance available—on an emergency basis—this summer so that desegregating school districts will be able to maintain educational quality and minimize disruption of the educational process during the desegregation period which must be underway by this fall.

Under the committee allowance, funds would be available in the form of comprehensive grants to desegregating—and recently desegregated—school districts for the purpose of hiring additional teachers and teacher aides, providing guidance and counseling and other direct services to school children, revising curriculum, purchasing special equipment, undertaking minor remodeling, supporting community programs and financing other additional costs which will contribute to carrying out a successful desegregation plan.

The program funds requested and allowed by the committee would remain available for obligation until September 30, 1970. Administrative support would be available for a full year since many of the projects funded would be operational during the coming school year and will require administrative assistance throughout this period.

A significant share of the appropriation, as much as \$100 million, will be expended under title II of the Economic Opportunity Act. This will require a delegation of authority from the Office of Economic Opportunity to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Such delegations are allowable under the Economic Opportunity Act. The remainder of the appropriation, about \$50 million, will be expended under authorities vested in HEW and the Office of Education. Administration witnesses testified that use of these several authorities was necessary in order to provide the broad range of services required by desegregating school districts. They indicated that this arrangement represents a one-time, temporary expedient to deal with the immediate problems faced by schools this summer and that the Emergency School Aid Act of 1970, which was introduced in the Senate on May 26, would form the basis for a more permanent future authority. Any further funding for assistance to desegregation by the schools will, according to departmental witnesses, be requested as part of the regular, 1971 and 1972 budgets following congressional action on the new legislation.

In recommending an appropriation of \$150 million to be applied under so many different authorities, the committee wants to be certain that there is a clear record of congressional intent as to the purposes for which the appropriation is made and the manner under which it is to be applied. First, consistent with recommendations of the administration, the funds shall be available, on a project grant basis, to assist any public school district under either a court order or with an approved plan to desegregate beginning with the school term that begins in the fall of 1970. Further, the school districts which have desegregated during the last 2 years under either a court order or an approved plan shall also be eligible. All of the funds are to be made available to deal with problems resulting from court orders or plans to overcome segregation.

Under no circumstance are any of the funds intended to be available to overcome racial isolation or racial imbalance.

As indicated above, the intent of the appropriation is to provide a broad range of financial and technical assistance, but the character and degree of assistance required shall, in every instance, be a matter of local initiative and determination.

Further, the committee believes strongly that these funds must not be used to finance directly or to encourage massive or excessive busing of students. Any transportation of students covered by this appropriation must be a part of either the court order or the approved desegregation plan.

The entire program of emergency school assistance would be administered by the Office of Education and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

A proviso is incorporated in this measure stating that no part of any funds appropriated in this measure shall be included as part of the amounts appropriated for the purpose of determining allocations for each purpose set forth in clauses (1) through (8) of section 102(b) of the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1969. The purpose of this limitation is to make clear that this appropriation is intended to have no effect whatever on the earmarking, allocation, and proration of OEO funds which would be required in the absence of this appropriation. The administration of OEO programs would otherwise be seriously disrupted in view of the lateness in the fiscal year. Further, it is not the intent of this measure, in any way, to inhibit or limit the authorities vested in the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity under section 616 of the Economic Opportunity Act with respect to the use of funds made available for carrying out programs under that act. On the other hand, this language in no way changes the intent or effect of the provisions of section 102(b) as to all other appropriations for carrying out the provisions of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

SOCIAL AND REHABILITATION SERVICE

GRANTS TO STATES FOR PUBLIC ASSISTANCE

1970 appropriation-----	\$7, 351, 551, 000
Supplemental estimate (H. Doc. 91-272)-----	146, 753, 000
House allowance-----	146, 753, 000
Committee recommendation-----	146, 753, 000

The committee concurs in the recommendation of the House allowing the full amount of the budget estimate. The committee realizes that the Department, under the provisions of the authorizing legislation, has little if any latitude to adjust the estimates of fund requirements as presented by the States. The amount of the supplemental estimate was developed from data accumulated from the States in November 1969. The request of \$146,753,000 is the net result of increases of \$259,155,000 and decreases of \$112,402,000. Most of the increase (\$208,721,000) is caused by higher estimates for aid to families with dependent children primarily resulting from the repeal of the AFDC "freeze." The decreases are primarily the result of lower estimates in the adult categories.

The committee is of the opinion that use of the declaration method for determining eligibility for assistance in the area of aid to families with dependent children could result in wide spread abuse and cautions the Department to move slowly and carefully in testing the method prior to full-scale adoption.

At the time of the Department's original request it indicated that legislation pending before the Congress for repeal of the AFDC freeze was estimated to increase its requirements by about \$322 million. The AFDC freeze was the provision of the Social Security Act which would have placed a limit on the number of children whose fathers were absent for reasons other than death who could be counted by the States in claiming Federal participation under the program of aid to families with dependent children. The Congress repealed this legislation which was scheduled to go into effect July 1, 1969.

SPECIAL INSTITUTIONS

HOWARD UNIVERSITY

Construction

1970 appropriation-----	\$52, 264, 000
Supplemental estimate (H. Doc. 91-272)-----	7, 700, 000
House allowance-----	7, 700, 000
Committee recommendation-----	7, 700, 000

The committee concurs with the House and the budget request in recommending a supplemental appropriation of \$7,700,000 to provide the additional funds needed to permit GSA to advertise for bids on the new Howard University teaching hospital. Plans for the hospital are now nearly complete and it is expected that bids will be advertised in the summer of 1970 and that construction will start in November 1970.

The new hospital is badly needed by the university as a replacement for Freedmen's Hospital in order to provide a modern teaching facility for Howard's College of Medicine and for students in other health fields. The amount listed in the 1970 budget request was based on 1967 cost data. Since that estimate was developed however, construction costs have been rising throughout the Nation and in the Washington, D.C., area in particular. Whereas the original estimate for

plans, construction, and basic equipment was \$23,430,000, the amount appropriated to date, the new estimate has now increased to \$31,130,000. The committee again expresses its desire for construction of the hospital to proceed as expeditiously as possible and urges that any further delays be avoided.

CHAPTER VIII

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

SENATE

In this title of the bill, the committee recommends the transfer of \$345,000 to the appropriation, "Inquiries and investigations", from "Salaries, officers and employees". This should provide sufficient funds to preclude the need for a deficiency appropriation to cover increased expenditures resulting from the increase in the authorizations for "Inquiries and investigations".

For mandatory increased pay costs in title II of the bill, the committee recommends a total of \$4,495,874 for the following Senate accounts:

Compensation of the Vice President and Senators.

Salaries, officers and employees.

Office of the Legislative Counsel of the Senate.

Senate policy committees.

Automobiles and maintenance.

Inquiries and investigations.

Folding documents.

Miscellaneous items.

In addition, the committee recommends an additional \$149,700 for those Senate items under the Architect of the Capitol appropriations—namely, "Senate office buildings" and "Senate garage".

The above items are detailed in the table at the conclusion of the report and are additions to the House bill, as they were not considered nor acted upon by the House of Representatives as is customary.

With respect to the Joint Economic Committee, for which \$44,490 was requested under title II and allowed by the House, the committee recommends an appropriation of \$43,475. This a decrease of \$1,015, the budget estimate having been overstated by that amount.

GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

The committee concurs in the House allowance of \$499,000, the amount requested, for the General Accounting Office. This sum will provide for the increase in travel per diem allowances authorized under Public Law 91-114, approved November 10, 1969.

CHAPTER IX

PUBLIC WORKS—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

COLORADO RIVER BASIN PROJECT

Appropriation, 1970	\$1, 200, 000
Supplemental estimate (H. Doc. 306)	(6, 563, 000)
House allowance	(6, 563, 000)
Committee recommendation	(6, 563, 000)

The committee concurs with the House, and recommends the budget estimate of \$6,563,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation "Construction and rehabilitation", to cover the Federal Government's share of the contractors earnings under the Navajo Project Participating Agreement. The need for the additional funds results from an advance in the construction schedule to assure commercial operation of the thermal electric generating plant by June of 1974.

CHAPTER X

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

CONTRIBUTIONS TO INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

1970 appropriation	\$130,187,000
1970 supplemental estimate (H. Doc. 91-272)	1,800,000
House allowance	1,600,000
Committee recommendation	1,600,000

The committee recommends the sum of \$1,600,000, which amount is \$200,000 below the budget estimate and the same as the House allowance to enable the United States to contribute its assessed share of converting the North Atlantic Treaty Organization headquarters at Evére, Belgium, to permanent quarters. The recommendation does not include funds for the proposed recreation center.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

FEES AND EXPENSES OF WITNESSES

1970 appropriation	\$5,000,000
1970 supplemental estimate (S. Doc. 91-67)	500,000
House allowance	(1)
Committee recommendation	500,000

¹ Not considered by House.

The committee recommends \$500,000, the supplemental budget estimate to pay the increased costs of fees and expenses of fact witnesses appearing in behalf of the Government in all cases to which the United States is a party. This supplemental request results from unanticipated increases in the number of witnesses called and in the costs in protecting witnesses.

IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE

1970 appropriation	\$94,619,000
1970 supplemental estimate (H. Doc. 91-272)	892,000
House allowance	892,000
Committee recommendation	892,000

For this item, the committee recommends the supplemental budget estimate of \$892,000 which is the same amount as allowed by the House to provide for unanticipated increased costs of transporting, detaining, and expelling illegal aliens.

FEDERAL PRISON SYSTEM

SUPPORT U.S. PRISONERS

1970 appropriation	\$7,900,000
1970 supplemental estimate (S. Doc. 91-67)	850,000
House allowance	(1)
Committee recommendation	850,000

¹ Not considered by House.

The committee recommends \$850,000 the supplemental budget estimate for increased costs in the support of U.S. prisoners in non-Federal institutions.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

NINETEENTH DECENNIAL CENSUS

1970 appropriation	\$137, 850, 000
1970 supplemental estimate (H. Doc. 91-272)	11, 000, 000
House allowance	11, 000, 000
Committee recommendation	11, 000, 000

The committee concurs with House allowance of \$11,000,000, the supplemental budget estimate for completing the field data collection in connection with the Nineteenth Decennial Census. Any of the funds that are not used for this purpose will remain available to cover other costs of the census.

OFFICE OF FIELD SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

1970 appropriation	\$5, 160, 000
1970 supplemental estimate (H. Doc. 91-272)	105, 000
House allowance	105, 000
Committee recommendation	105, 000

To improve the quality of the Commerce Business Daily the committee recommends the sum of \$105,000, the supplemental estimate and the House allowance. To cover the increased costs, the subscription price for this publication has been raised from \$15 to \$25 per year.

MARITIME ADMINISTRATION

STATE MARINE SCHOOLS

1970 appropriation	\$625, 000
1970 supplemental estimate (S. Doc. 91-67)	145, 000
House allowance	(¹)
Committee recommendation	145, 000

¹ Not considered by House.

The committee recommends \$145,000, the supplemental budget estimate which was expended to repair damage to the ship assigned to the New York State Marine School. Reimbursement is required so that three State schools which have not made their annual cruises will be able to complete necessary repairs for this purpose.

THE JUDICIARY

CUSTOMS COURT

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

1970 appropriation	\$1, 870, 000
1970 supplemental estimate (H. Doc. 91-272)	60, 500
House allowance	18, 000
Committee recommendation	18, 000

The committee concurs with the House allowance of \$18,000 to cover the increased allowances for travel and per diem as authorized by law.

COURTS OF APPEALS, DISTRICT COURTS, AND OTHER JUDICIAL SERVICES

SALARIES AND EXPENSES OF U.S. MAGISTRATES

1970 appropriation-----	None
1970 supplemental estimate (H. Doc. 91-272)-----	\$560, 000
House allowance-----	550, 000
Committee recommendation-----	550, 000

The committee recommends the sum of \$550,000, the House allowance and a reduction of \$10,000 in the supplemental request. The sum recommended is for salaries and expenses of full-time and part-time magistrates appointed pursuant to the Federal Magistrates Act, Public Law 90-578 (Oct. 17, 1968) under a pilot project which includes the U.S. District Courts for the Southern District of California, the District of Columbia, Kansas, New Jersey, and the Eastern District of Virginia.

SALARIES OF SUPPORTING PERSONNEL

1970 appropriation-----	\$47, 957, 000
1970 supplemental estimate (H. Doc. 91-272)-----	145, 000
House allowance-----	None
Committee recommendation-----	None

The committee concurs with the House in denying the supplemental request of \$145,000 to provide grade increases for certain positions to have been effective April 1, 1970. This request will be considered in the regular annual appropriation bill for fiscal 1971.

FEES AND EXPENSES OF COURT-APPOINTED COUNSEL

1969 appropriation-----	\$4, 000, 000
1970 appropriation-----	3, 150, 000
1969 supplemental estimate (H. Doc. 91-273)-----	300, 000
1970 supplemental estimate (H. Doc. 91-272)-----	1, 150, 000
House allowance, 1969-----	300, 000
House allowance, 1970-----	1, 150, 000
Committee recommendation, 1969-----	300, 000
Committee recommendation, 1970-----	1, 150, 000

The committee concurs with the House allowance of \$1,150,000 for the fiscal year 1970, as well as the sum of \$300,000 additional for fiscal year 1969, the supplemental budget estimate to liquidate obligations incurred under the Criminal Justice Act of 1964.

FEES OF JURORS AND COMMISSIONERS

1970 appropriation-----	\$15, 000, 000
1970 supplemental estimate (H. Doc. 91-272)-----	800, 000
House allowance-----	500, 000
Committee recommendation-----	500, 000

The committee recommends the sum of \$500,000, the House allowance and a reduction of \$300,000 in the supplemental budget estimate of \$800,000. The committee has been informed that the sum recommended will be sufficient to meet a projected deficiency in funds available for payment of fees and allowances of jurors for the balance of fiscal 1970.

TRAVEL AND MISCELLANEOUS EXPENSES

1970 appropriation-----	\$7, 000, 000
1970 supplemental estimate (H. Doc. 91-272)-----	625, 000
House allowance-----	500, 000
Committee recommendation-----	500, 000

The committee concurs with the House allowance of \$500,000, a reduction of \$125,000 in the supplemental estimate of \$625,000. The sum recommended will be used to cover the increased subsistence allowances for official travel authorized by Public Law 91-114, increased printing costs, the replacement of damaged and/or stolen equipment, and acquisition of pocket parts and other materials for court libraries.

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE U.S. COURTS

1970 appropriation-----	\$2, 050, 000
1970 supplemental estimate (H. Doc. 91-272)-----	50, 000
House allowance-----	15, 000
Committee recommendation-----	15, 000

The committee recommends the House allowance of \$15,000 to cover increased per diem costs authorized by the act of November 10, 1969, Public Law 91-114.

EXPENSES OF REFEREES

1970 appropriation-----	\$8, 650, 000
1970 supplemental estimate (H. Doc. 91-272)-----	34, 000
House allowance-----	None
Committee recommendation-----	None

The committee concurs with the House in disapproving the supplemental budget estimate of \$34,000 for increased travel costs for the balance of fiscal year 1970.

RELATED AGENCIES

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

OFFICE OF EDUCATION

CIVIL RIGHTS EDUCATION

1970 appropriation-----	\$14, 000, 000
1970 supplemental estimate (H. Doc. 91-272)-----	10, 000, 000
House allowance-----	5, 000, 000
Committee recommendation-----	5, 000, 000

The committee recommends the sum of \$5 million, the House allowance and a reduction of \$5 million in the supplemental budget estimate. The sum recommended will further fund the activities carried on pursuant to title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. The fiscal year 1970 regular appropriation act provided \$14 million for aid to local jurisdictions in planning and implementing the desegregation of public schools.

SPECIAL REPRESENTATIVE FOR TRADE NEGOTIATIONS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

1970 appropriation-----	\$482, 000
1970 supplemental estimate (H. Doc. 91-272)-----	60, 000
House allowance-----	None
Committee recommendation-----	None

The committee concurs with the House in disallowing the supplemental budget request of \$60,000 to be used to fund seven new positions for the balance of fiscal 1970. This matter will be considered in connection with the regular annual appropriation bill for fiscal 1971.

FEDERAL PRISON INDUSTRIES, INCORPORATED

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE AND VOCATIONAL EXPENSES

Federal Prison Industries, Incorporated

1970 appropriation-----	(\$817, 000)
1970 supplemental authorization requested (S. Doc. 91-67)-----	(55, 000)
House allowance-----	(¹)
Committee recommendation-----	(55, 000)

¹ Not considered by the House.

The committee has approved the requested increase of \$55,000 in the administrative expense limitation for fiscal 1970 for the Federal Prison Industries, Inc., and has included such additional sum in title II of the bill.

CHAPTER XI

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AND RELATED AGENCIES

COAST GUARD

RETIRED PAY

1970 appropriations to date-----	\$57, 750, 000
Supplemental request (H. Doc. 91-306)-----	1, 250, 000
House allowance-----	1, 250, 000
Committee recommendation-----	1, 000, 000

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$1 million, which is \$250,000 under the budget request and the House allowance, to provide for increased military retirement pay costs resulting from mandatory increases tied to rises in the Consumer Price Index.

The committee was informed that on the basis of the most recent evaluation of requirements, that the reduced additional amount would be ample for the balance of fiscal 1970.

RELATED AGENCIES

WASHINGTON METROPOLITAN AREA TRANSIT AUTHORITY

FEDERAL CONTRIBUTION

1970 appropriations to date-----	\$43, 173, 000
Supplemental request (H. Doc. 91-272)-----	82, 939, 000
House allowance-----	82, 939, 000
Committee recommendation-----	82, 939, 000

This supplemental request is the second part of the fiscal year 1970 program and is based upon the approval by the Congress of the expanded Regional Transit System in the National Capital Transportation Act of 1969 (Public Law 91-143). The committee recommends the amount of the House allowance and the budget request in order to avoid cost escalation associated with failure to keep pace with the construction schedule and the upsetting of the complex regional financing arrangements thus far accomplished.

The committee was pleased to learn that the problem which lead to the delay which concerned the House has been resolved. On June 1, 1970, the Secretary of Transportation rescinded his construction freeze order in recognition of the adoption of an area wide equal opportunity hiring plan by the Secretary of Labor.

This matter having been resolved, the committee is hopeful that the program will now move forward in accordance with the time schedule upon which the overall financial plan was predicated.

CHAPTER XII

TREASURY DEPARTMENT

BUREAU OF ACCOUNTS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

1970 appropriation (to date)-----	\$45, 675, 000
Supplemental request (S. Doc. 91-67)-----	1, 320, 000
House allowance-----	(Not considered)
Committee recommendation-----	1, 300, 000

The committee recommends the amount of \$1,300,000, a reduction of \$20,000 in the estimate for activities under this head. The amount recommended is \$1,300,000 over the House as this item was contained in S. Doc. 91-67 and was not considered by the House.

The amount recommended provides for the costs of the April 1970, mailing of 22 million social security checks for retroactive increases in social security payments effective January 1, 1970, as authorized by the Social Security Amendments of 1969, Public Law 91-172.

BUREAU OF THE PUBLIC DEBT

ADMINISTERING THE PUBLIC DEBT

1970 appropriation-----	\$60, 370, 000
Supplemental request (H. Doc. 91-272)-----	3, 250, 000
House allowance-----	3, 250, 000
Supplemental request (S. Doc. 91-67)-----	350, 000
Committee recommendation (total)-----	3, 600, 000

The committee recommends \$3,600,000, the sum total of the budget estimates submitted in House Document 91-272 (\$3,250,000) and Senate Document 91-67 (\$350,000). The amount recommended is \$350,000 over the House allowance and this estimate was contained in Senate Document 91-67 which was not considered by the House.

The additional \$350,000 recommended by the Committee is necessary because of an increase in Federal Reserve Bank reimbursable costs.

The amount recommended provides \$1,000,000 for increased payments to banks and other paying agents who redeem savings-type securities in behalf of the Government, \$2,350,000 for increased reimbursable operating costs of Federal Reserve banks acting as fiscal agents of the Bureau of the Public Debt and \$250,000 for the cost of printing, at higher unit costs, a larger quantity of marketable securities than originally estimated.

U.S. SECRET SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

1970 appropriation-----	\$30, 871, 000
Supplemental request (H. Doc. 91-272)-----	1, 740, 000
House allowance-----	1, 740, 000
Supplemental request (S. Doc. 91-67)-----	259, 000
House allowance-----	(Not considered)
Committee recommendation (total)-----	1, 940, 000

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$1,940,000 for salaries and expenses, U.S. Secret Service. Of the amount recommended, \$1,740,000 (H. Doc. 91-272) is for increased pay costs for Secret Service personnel, exclusive of Executive Protective Service personnel. The remaining \$200,000 allowed (budget estimate contained in Senate Document 91-67 and not considered by the House), is to provide for increases in pay for Executive Protective Service policemen as proposed by pending legislation amending the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act.

The amount recommended is \$59,000 under the estimate contained in Senate Document 91-67. Furthermore, the \$200,000 additional recommended by the committee is contingent upon the enactment of S. 2694, or similar legislation.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

(Out of the Postal Fund)

TRANSPORTATION

1970 appropriation-----	\$630, 000, 000
Supplemental request (H. Doc. 91-272)-----	10, 700, 000
House allowance-----	10, 700, 000
Committee recommendation-----	10, 600, 000

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$10,600,000, a reduction of \$100,000 under the budget estimate and House allowance, for Transportation, Post Office Department.

The funds recommended are to meet anticipated transportation obligations for the balance of the fiscal year 1970 which are currently exceeding the original estimates upon which the budget was based. The immediate need for this supplemental is caused by rate increases associated with mandatory wage determinations by the Department of Labor affecting trucking costs, air tax rate adjustments by the CAB, rate increases for air service to Guam, and negotiated terminal and piece-handling rate increases for the railroads.

INDEPENDENT AGENCY

TAX COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

1970 appropriation	\$2, 815, 000
Supplemental request (H. Doc. 91-272)	83, 000
House allowance	83, 000
Committee recommendation	67, 000

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$67,000, a reduction of \$16,000 in the estimate and House allowance, for increased expenses of the Tax Court resulting from changes brought about by the Tax Reform Act of 1969 (Public Law 91-172, approved December 30, 1969). These changes include the addition of two commissioners, with concomitant support staff and increased travel costs.

CHAPTER XIII

CLAIMS AND JUDGMENTS

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$23,478,461 to pay claims and judgments rendered against the United States. The House bill contained \$6,591,406 for this purpose, the details of which were contained in H. Doc. 91-315. Subsequent to passage of the bill in the House, an additional sum of \$16,887,055 was submitted, the details of which will be found in S. Doc. 91-86.

TITLES II AND III

INCREASED PAY COSTS

The following tabulation shows the new budget (obligational) authority for pay cost increases in the bill:

	Estimate of budget authority	House bill	Senate committee	Senate bill estimates	Compared with House bill
Title I	¹ \$96, 781, 000	¹ \$96, 781, 000	¹ \$96, 781, 000		
Title II	² 3, 028, 779, 786	2, 909, 729, 830	2, 955, 594, 389	-73, 185, 397	+45, 864, 559
Title III	1, 350, 000, 000	1, 350, 000, 000	1, 350, 000, 000		
Total	2 4, 475, 560, 786	4, 356, 510, 830	4, 402, 375, 389	-73, 185, 397	+45, 864, 559

¹ Consists of \$91,500,000 for the Veterans' Administration and \$5,281,000 for Selective Service System.

² The budget estimate column includes \$4,716,116 for Senate items and \$259,000 for the Secret Service submitted in S. Doc. 91-67 not considered by the House.

The increases made by the committee for pay cost increases in title II of the bill are as follows:

U.S. Senate (not considered by House)	+ \$4, 495, 874
Architect of Capitol (Senate items, not considered by House) ..	+ 149, 700
Joint Economic Committee	- 1, 015
Department of Defense	+ 41, 020, 000
Department of Justice	(+ 55, 000)
Treasury Department	+ 200, 000
Appalachian Regional Commission	(+ 42, 000)
District of Columbia items	(+ 2, 043, 000)
Total increase	45, 864, 559

A detailed tabulation of the budget estimates, the House figures and the committee recommendations appears at the end of the Senate committee report.

TITLE II

Title II of the bill includes the bulk of supplemental funds required to meet the unabsorbed portion of increased pay and related costs for fiscal 1970. Title I of the bill includes the remainder of the funds for this purpose. The regular 1970 appropriations did not allow for these costs, and agencies have been spending on a deficiency basis as the law permits in such cases. (Section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665).)

The greatest share of increased pay costs in this title result from the Federal comparability pay raises made effective July 1, 1969. These increases result from Public Laws 90-206 and 90-207, which cover postal and other civilian employees, military personnel, legislative, and judicial employees. Increases for employees of the District of Columbia as well as for wage-board employees in line with prevailing rates are also covered by this title.

The total cost of these pay increases was estimated in the February 1970 budget to be \$3,737,613,212. To cover the cost the President requested \$3,125,051,786 in new budget (obligational) authority in H. Doc. 91-272 and \$250,000 in H. Doc. 91-306, and proposed to absorb the difference from previously appropriated funds. In addition, \$259,000 was requested in S. Doc. 91-67 for a grand total of \$3,125,560,786. The absorption amounts to \$612,561,426, or about 16 percent of the total.

The committee has examined the request carefully and has found it necessary to make the modest increases set forth herein.

TITLE III

(Federal Employees Salary Act of 1970)

This title of the bill relates to additional funds for increased pay costs arising during the current fiscal year 1970 from enactment of Public Law 91-231, approved April 15, 1970, the Federal Employees Salary Act of 1970—the so-called 6-percent retroactive pay bill, effective generally back to December 27, 1969. (Title II of the bill, explained above, relates to additional funds for civilian and military personnel pay increases that were generally effective from the beginning of the fiscal year 1970 last July 1.)

The committee concurs with the House and recommends a single, lump sum, indefinite appropriation for the purposes of Public Law 91-231. The best estimate available to the committee of additional cost during the 6 months the law will be in effect in fiscal 1970 is \$1,350 million. That may or may not be the final additional total of appropriations actually put on the books under the indefinite provision in the bill. Some portion—now indeterminable—of the costs may eventually be absorbed by transfers between existing appropriations, or otherwise.

The appropriation covers additional costs of the pay increase in fiscal 1970 for military personnel; for postal employees; and, generally.

those other civilian employees except where rates of pay are fixed periodically on a prevailing wage basis (so-called wage-board employees).

It covers all three branches of the Government. It includes the District of Columbia government.

Except for technical conforming changes, the lump sum, indefinite appropriation approach corresponds exactly with that used in similar retroactive pay situations in 1958 and 1955. (The President, in H. Doc. 91-322, has recommended this approach.)

TITLE IV

LIMITATION ON FISCAL YEAR 1970 BUDGET OUTLAYS

In title IV of this bill language has been included by the House, in which the committee concurs, which amends the fiscal year 1970 budget outlay (expenditure) ceiling enacted last year.

The Congress, in the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1969, signed July 22, 1969, enacted a limitation on budget outlays for fiscal year 1970. The ceiling in that law was \$191.9 billion with provision for adjustment upward or downward depending upon the action or inaction of the Congress on the revised budget figures submitted by the President on April 15, 1969, and with a cushion of \$2 billion for any increases in uncontrollables over the revised April 1969 figures.

In his budget message to Congress on February 2, 1970, the President said that the \$2 billion allowance for increases in uncontrollable expenditures appears to be completely unrealistic. Spending estimated at that time on uncontrollable programs appeared to be \$4.3 billion higher than the estimate of April 1969.

In March 1970, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget advised the Congress that the outlay limitation and the allowances for its adjustment appeared completely unrealistic. He stated that although controllable expenditures had been held firmly within the limits intended by the Congress, expenditures for uncontrollable programs exceeded appreciably the maximum permitted by the statute. The Budget Director recommended that the fixed allowance for designated uncontrollable outlays be removed, and that a \$1 billion prudent management cushion be provided to him.

The Director of the Bureau of the Budget recently advised the committee that expenditures on some uncontrollable items are now estimated to be higher than estimated for in the February budget. Interest on the debt for fiscal year 1970, as an example, is now estimated to be \$550 million above the February estimate.

Other actions and inactions of the executive branch and the Congress served to contribute to changes upward and downward in the ceiling. Supplemental estimates and budget amendments were sent to the Congress by the President. Congress made changes in the budget in some instances over the President's request and in other instances under the President's request. In other instances, Congress did not act on several proposals which had an effect on the ceiling.

The budget of the President, submitted February 2, 1970, gave the revised expenditure estimate for fiscal year 1970 of \$197.9 billion. The following tabulation gives the figures to February 2:

[Billions]		
	In relation to—	
	Original estimate	Original ceiling
Original estimate and original ceiling.....	\$192.9	\$191.9
Changes—	-1.0	
1. Original blanket cut by Congress.....		
2. Administration underestimates on designated uncontrollables (on which annual action is not required).....	+4.3	+4.3
3. Actions and inactions on original April 1969 estimates (includes about \$1,200,000,000 for administration additions):		
Appropriation acts.....	-1.9	-1.9
Other acts (social security, etc.).....	+1.5	+1.5
Inactions (postal rates, sales of financial assets, etc.).....	+1.3	+1.3
Subtotal, actions and inactions.....	+ .9	+ .9
4. Anticipated 2d session actions affecting fiscal 1970 (pay raises, veterans, public assistance, etc.).....	+ .9	+ .9
5. Nominal margin in revised estimate for other spending.....	-.1	-.1
Net change, all factors.....	+5.0	+6.0
Revised 1970 spending estimate (in 1971 budget).....	197.9	197.9

The most recent estimate of the Bureau of the Budget on the overrun on uncontrollables is found in the following tabulation:

[Dollars in billions]				
Uncontrollable items designated in House bill (under laws in effect April 1969)	1970 outlays			
	April 1969 estimate	February budget estimate	Current estimate	Change from April 1969 estimate
Social insurance trust funds.....	42.1	43.8	43.4	+1.3
National service life insurance.....	.7	.7	.7	-.0
Interest.....	16.4	17.8	18.4	+2.0
Farm price supports.....	3.6	3.5	3.8	+.2
Sales of financial assets.....	-3.0	-2.1	-2.1	+.8
Leases of lands on Outer Continental Shelf.....	-.6	-.3	-.2	+.4
Total.....	59.1	63.4	63.9	+4.8

In the bill before the committee the House has restated the language of the ceiling in the bill. The House language supersedes the old ceiling with a new ceiling of \$197,885 million, the new revised budget estimate. Language has been retained which would serve to continuously adjust the ceiling for congressional actions and inactions. The recent 6 percent retroactive pay bill is an example of an action which would serve to increase the ceiling. The House language contains a prudent management cushion of one-half of 1 percent which amounts to approximately \$1 billion and, in addition, the House language provides another \$1 billion cushion for any further increase in uncontrollables, for a total of approximately \$199.9 billion excluding the effect of Congressional changes.

The Director of the Bureau of the Budget, although preferring to have reductions effected in the individual requests for new obligational authority, finds the House language satisfactory. The latest estimate (May 19, 1970) of fiscal year 1970 expenditures is \$198.2 billion.

TITLE V

LIMITATION ON FISCAL YEAR 1971 BUDGET OUTLAYS

The Senate Committee recommends that the House language on the limitation on fiscal year 1971 budget outlays be amended to give the administration a cushion of \$6 billion rather than \$3 billion, as set forth in the House bill, for increases in uncontrollable items.

The House provision in the bill provides that expenditures and net lending (budget outlays) during the fiscal year 1971 shall not exceed \$200,771 million. This is the precise amount of the President's Budget submitted on February 2, 1970.

In justification of its language, the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives said on page 95 of its report:

The committee, in initiating an all-encompassing ceiling last year, was not seeking to advance a vehicle for arbitrary broad-ax type cutbacks that would leave to the executive the allocation of any spending reduction to specific agencies and programs. The whole idea was to focus on the totality of Federal spending by putting the control of *total* spending in the hands of Congress adjustable *only* by the Congress.

It is not too widely recognized that in the various annual bills affecting the budget, Congress, in respect to the \$200.8 billion fiscal 1971 spending budget would normally deal with requests involving less than half of that spending total—about 47 percent to be more exact. (The other 53 percent springs from unexpended carryover balances from previous years and from so-called permanent appropriations that arise automatically under earlier laws.)

By covering the annual expenditures from all sources the ceiling focuses on the total and tends to keep it in focus. And such a ceiling affords the opportunity to force attention on possible alternatives and substitutes when upward pressures are exerted on the ceiling.

The ceiling in the bill is increased or decreased by action or inaction of the Congress on the recommendations in the fiscal year 1971 budget estimate. The House bill proposes a \$3 billion cushion for increases in uncontrollables upon which the Congress does not act annually, and which are listed on page 49 of the Budget. The items are:

- Social security, medicare, and other social insurance trust funds;
- National service life insurance (trust fund);
- Interest; and
- Farm price supports (Commodity Credit Corporation).

Decline of receipts (credited in the budget against expenditures and net lending) derived from—

Sales of financial assets of programs administered by the Farmers Home Administration, Export-Import Bank, agencies of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and Veterans' Administration, and

Leases of lands on the Outer Continental Shelf.

Based upon experience both in regard to fiscal year 1970 and fiscal year 1971, there have been large increases in these uncontrollable items. As late as May 19, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget supplied the committee with a tabulation which indicated that the estimated outlays for uncontrollable items as of that date were \$1.8 billion in excess of the estimates for comparable items contained in the President's budget submitted on February 2, just a few months earlier. The tabulation supplied by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget is as follows:

[Dollars in billions]

Uncontrollable items designated in House bill	1971 outlays		
	February budget estimate	Current estimate	Change from February estimate
Social insurance trust funds.....	51.6	51.7	+0.2
National service life insurance.....	.7	.7	-----
Interest.....	17.8	18.8	+1.0
Farm price supports.....	3.7	4.0	+.3
Sales of financial assets.....	-3.9	-3.6	+.3
Leases of lands on Outer Continental Shelf.....	-1.0	-1.0	-----
Total.....	68.8	70.6	+1.8

In view of the history of increases on uncontrollable items, the committee believed it prudent to increase the cushion from \$3 billion to \$6 billion.

The \$200.8 billion outlay figure for fiscal year 1971 includes outlays from budget authority to be granted in this session; outlays from so-called permanent appropriations that flow automatically from earlier years and outlays from unexpended balances of carryover funds.

Approximately \$96 billion of the \$200.8 billion expenditure in fiscal year 1971, derive from these prior year balances and approximately \$105 billion from new authority found in the fiscal year 1971 budget, including permanent appropriations not considered by the Congress on an annual basis.

TITLE VI

VALIDATING CLAUSE

The following provision which will authorize obligation of funds until July 1, 1970, or for 5 days following the date of approval of the second supplemental Appropriation Act, whichever is later, together with language validating obligations incurred in anticipation of this act, has been included in the bill by the committee. This provision is necessary in view of the delay in this bill.

A similar provision was contained in the second supplemental Appropriation Act for fiscal year 1968 and again for fiscal year 1969.

The provision reads as follows:

Title VI

Funds appropriated, or otherwise made available, by this Act for the fiscal year 1970, shall remain available for obligation until July 1, 1970, or for five days after the date of approval of this Act, whichever is later, unless a longer period is specifically provided: *Provided*, That all obligations incurred in anticipation of such appropriations and authority for the fiscal year 1970 as well as those for longer periods as set forth herein are hereby ratified and confirmed if in accordance with the terms hereof.

**COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS
RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL**

TITLE I—GENERAL SUPPLEMENTALS

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimate	Recommended in House bill	Amount recom- mended by Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (-), Senate bill compared with—	
					Budget estimate	House bill
	TITLE I					
	CHAPTER I					
	DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE					
	EXTENSION SERVICE					
91-272	Cooperative Extension work, payments and expenses (<i>by transfer</i>)	(\$597, 000)	(\$597, 000)	(\$425, 000)	(-\$172, 000)	(-\$172, 000)
	CHAPTER II					
	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—MILITARY					
	RETIRED MILITARY PERSONNEL					
91-272	Retired pay, Defense, new budget (obligational) authority	99, 000, 000	99, 000, 000	99, 000, 000		
	CHAPTER III					
	DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA					
	FEDERAL FUNDS					
91-288 and S. Doc. 91-82	Federal payment to District of Columbia	5, 831, 000		1, 042, 000	-1, 789, 000	+4, 042, 000

91-272	Loans to the District of Columbia for capital outlay.....	1, 293, 000	1, 293, 000	1, 293, 000	-----
	Total, Federal funds.....	7, 124, 000	1, 293, 000	5, 335, 000	+ 4, 042, 000
	DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FUNDS				
91-288 and S. Doc. 91-82	General operating expenses.....	(202, 000)	(2, 675)	(174, 675)	(+172, 000)
91-288 and S. Doc. 91-82	Public Safety.....	(6, 892, 000)	(2, 370, 500)	(3, 966, 485)	(+1, 595, 985)
91-288	Education.....	(2, 500, 000)	-----	-----	-----
91-288 and S. Doc. 91-82	Parks and recreation.....	(234, 000)	(47, 900)	(171, 750)	(+124, 450)
S. Doc. 91-82	Health and welfare.....	(2, 850, 000)	-----	-----	-----
S. Doc. 91-82	Settlement of claims and suits.....	(20, 000)	-----	(20, 000)	(+20, 000)
91-272, 91-288, and S. Doc. 91-82	Capital outlay.....	(8, 768, 000)	(1, 658, 000)	(8, 768, 000)	(+7, 110, 000)
	Total, District of Columbia funds.....	(21, 466, 000)	(4, 078, 475)	(13, 100, 910)	(+9, 032, 495)
	Total, Chapter III, new budget (obligational) authority.....	7, 124, 000	1, 293, 000	5, 335, 000	+ 4, 042, 000

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL—Continued

TITLE I—GENERAL SUPPLEMENTALS—Continued

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimate	Recommended in House bill	Amount recom- mended by Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (-), Senate bill compared with—	
					Budget estimate	House bill
	CHAPTER IV FOREIGN OPERATIONS FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT FOREIGN ASSISTANCE					
S. Doc. 91-67	Foreign military credit sales.....	\$275,000,000	-----	\$250,000,000	-\$25,000,000	+\$250,000,000
91-272	PEACE CORPS Salaries and expenses (<i>increase in limitation</i>).....	(349,000)	-----	-----	(-349,000)	-----
91-272	INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL INSTITUTION Investment in Inter-American Development Bank.....	205,880,000	\$205,880,000	205,880,000	-----	-----
	Total, chapter IV, new budget (obligational) authority.....	480,880,000	205,880,000	455,880,000	-25,000,000	+250,000,000
	<i>Increase in limitation</i>	(349,000)	-----	-----	(-349,000)	-----
	CHAPTER V INDEPENDENT OFFICES CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION					
91-306	Federal Labor Relations Council: Salaries and expenses.....	Language	Language	Language	-----	-----
S. Doc. 91-84	Payment to Civil Service retirement and disability fund.....	157,816,600	-----	157,816,600	-----	+157,816,600

91-273	COMMISSION ON POPULATION GROWTH AND THE AMERICAN FUTURE	1,433,000	965,000	965,000	-468,000	
	Salaries and expenses.....					
S. Doc. 91-67	GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION REAL PROPERTY ACTIVITIES	371,000		371,000		+371,000
	Sites and expenses, public buildings projects.....					
91-272	SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM	7,433,000	7,000,000	7,433,000		+433,000
	Salaries and expenses.....					
91-272	VETERANS ADMINISTRATION					
	Compensation and pensions.....	273,045,000	273,045,000	273,045,000		
91-272 91-312	Readjustment benefits.....	330,500,000	327,500,000	327,500,000	-3,000,000	
91-272 1-293	Medical care.....	106,500,000	113,500,000	113,500,000	+7,000,000	
	Total, Veterans' Administration.....	710,045,000	714,045,000	714,045,000	+4,000,000	
	EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT					
	COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY AND OFFICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY					
S. Doc. 91-67	Salaries and expenses.....	600,000	100,000	200,000	-400,000	+100,000
91-272	FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT					
	Disaster Relief.....	100,000,000	75,000,000	75,000,000	-25,000,000	

**COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS
RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL—Continued**

TITLE I—GENERAL SUPPLEMENTALS—Continued

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimate	Recommended in House bill	Amount recom- mended by Senate committee	Budget estimate House bill	Increase (+) or decrease (-), Senate bill compared with—
	DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT					
	RENEWAL AND HOUSING ASSISTANCE					
	Low rent public housing annual contributions:					
91-272	1969-----	\$13,616,000	\$13,616,000	\$13,616,000		
	1970-----	6,500,000				-\$6,500,000
91-272	College Housing (annual contract authorization, increase in limitation)-----	(5,500,000)	(5,000,000)	(5,000,000)		(-500,000)
	MORTGAGE CREDIT					
91-273	Homeownership and rental housing assistance (annual contract authorizations, increase in limitation):					
	Homeownership assistance-----	(25,000,000)	(35,000,000)	(35,000,000)		(+10,000,000)
	Rental housing assistance-----	(25,000,000)	(35,000,000)	(35,000,000)		(+10,000,000)
	Total, Department of Housing and Urban Development:					
	1969-----	13,616,000	13,616,000	13,616,000		
	1970-----	6,500,000				-6,500,000
	Total-----	20,116,000	13,616,000	13,616,000		-6,500,000
	New annual contract authorization, increase in limitation-----	(55,500,000)	(75,000,000)	(75,000,000)		(+19,500,000)

Total, chapter V:					
New budget (obligational) authority:					
	1969.....	13, 616, 000	13, 616, 000	13, 616, 000	-----
	1970.....	984, 198, 600	797, 110, 000	955, 830, 600	+\$158, 720, 600
	Total.....	997, 814, 600	810, 726, 000	969, 446, 600	+158, 720, 600
	<i>New annual contract authorization, increase in limitation.....</i>	<i>(55, 500, 000)</i>	<i>(75, 000, 000)</i>	<i>(75, 000, 000)</i>	-----
CHAPTER VI					
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR					
PUBLIC LAND MANAGEMENT					
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT					
91-272	Management of lands and resources.....	23, 790, 000	23, 790, 000	23, 790, 000	-----
	BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS				-----
91-272	Resources management.....	700, 000	700, 000	700, 000	-----
	BUREAU OF OUTDOOR RECREATION				-----
91-272	Land and water conservation.....	7, 100, 000	7, 100, 000	7, 100, 000	-----
	OFFICE OF TERRITORIES				-----
91-272	Administration of territories.....	275, 000	275, 000	275, 000	-----
	MINERAL RESOURCES				-----
	GEOLOGICAL SURVEY				-----
S. Doc. 91-67	Surveys, investigations and research.....	300, 000	-----	225, 000	+225, 000
	FISH AND WILDLIFE, PARKS, AND MARINE RESOURCES				-----
	NATIONAL PARK SERVICE				-----
91-272	Management and protection.....	850, 000	850, 000	775, 000	-75, 000

**COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS
RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL—Continued**

TITLE I—GENERAL SUPPLEMENTALS—Continued

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimate	Recommended in House bill	Amount recom- mended by Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (-), Senate bill compared with—	
					Budget estimate	House bill
	CHAPTER VI—Continued RELATED AGENCIES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE					
	FOREST SERVICE					
91-272	Forest protection and utilization.....	\$21,000,000	\$21,000,000	\$21,172,000	+\$172,000	+\$172,000
	NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES					
91-272	Salaries and expenses.....	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000		
	Total, chapter VI, new budget (obligational) authority.....	56,015,000	55,715,000	56,037,000	+22,000	+322,000
	CHAPTER VII DEPARTMENT OF LABOR					
	MANPOWER ADMINISTRATION					
S. Doc. 91-	Manpower development and training activities.....	50,000,000		50,000,000		+50,000,000
	BUREAU OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY					
91-272	Unemployment compensation for Federal employees and ex-servicemen.....	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000		
S. Doc. 91-67	Trade adjustment activities.....	2,330,000		2,330,000		+2,330,000
91-272	Limitation on grants to States for unemployment compensation and employ- ment service administration.....	(10,000,000)	(10,000,000)	(10,000,000)		

WAGE AND LABOR STANDARDS ADMINISTRATION					
91-272	Salaries and expenses.....	37,000 (43,000)	37,000 (43,000)	37,000 (43,000)	-----
	Longshoremen's and harbor workers compensation fund (<i>by transfer</i>).....				-----
	OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY				
91-272	Federal contract compliance and civil rights program, salaries and expenses.	160,000	107,000	107,000	-----
	Total, Department of Labor.....	102,527,000	50,144,000	102,474,000	+52,330,000
	By transfer.....	(43,000)	(43,000)	(43,000)	-----
	Limitation (<i>trust fund</i>).....	(10,000,000)	(10,000,000)	(10,000,000)	-----
	DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE				
	HEALTH SERVICES AND MENTAL HEALTH ADMINISTRATION				
	Hospital construction.....	-----	-----	8,703,078	+8,703,078
	OFFICE OF EDUCATION				
S. Doc. 91-83	Emergency school assistance.....	150,000,000	-----	150,000,000	+150,000,000
	SOCIAL AND REHABILITATION SERVICE				
91-272	Grants to States for public assistance.....	146,753,000	146,753,000	146,753,000	-----
	SPECIAL INSTITUTIONS				
91-272	Howard University, construction.....	7,700,000	7,700,000	7,700,000	-----
	Total, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.....	304,453,000	154,453,000	313,156,078	+158,703,078
	Total, chapter VII:				
	New budget (obligational) authority.....	406,980,000	204,597,000	415,630,078	+211,033,078
	By transfer.....	(43,000)	(43,000)	(43,000)	-----
	Limitation (<i>trust fund</i>).....	(10,000,000)	(10,000,000)	(10,000,000)	-----

**COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS
RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL—Continued**

TITLE I—GENERAL SUPPLEMENTALS—Continued

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimate	Recommended in House bill	Amount recom- mended by Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (-), Senate bill compared with—	
					Budget estimate	House bill
	CHAPTER VIII					
	LEGISLATIVE BRANCH					
	SENATE					
	CONTINGENT EXPENSES					
	Expenses of inquiries and investigations (<i>by transfer</i>)			(\$245,000)	(+\$245,000)	(+\$245,000)
	HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES					
	SALARIES, MILEAGE FOR THE MEMBERS, AND EXPENSE ALLOWANCE OF THE SPEAKER					
91-272	Compensation of Members	\$47,000	\$47,000	47,000		
91-306	SALARIES, OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES					
	Committee on Appropriations (investigations)	35,555	35,555	35,555		
	CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE HOUSE					
91-306	Miscellaneous items	50,000	50,000	50,000		
91-272	Special and select committees	500,000	100,000	100,000	-400,000	
	Total, House of Representatives	632,555	232,555	232,555	-400,000	
91-272	GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE					
	Salaries and expenses	499,000	499,000	499,000		

Total, chapter VIII, new budget (obligational) authority-----		1,131,555	731,555	-400,000	-----
<i>By transfer</i> -----			(345,000)	(+345,000)	(+345,000)
CHAPTER IX					
PUBLIC WORKS					
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR					
BUREAU OF RECLAMATION					
91-306	Colorado River Basin Project (<i>by transfer</i>)-----	(6,563,000)	(6,563,000)		-----
CHAPTER X					
DEPARTMENT OF STATE					
INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND CONFERENCES					
91-272	Contributions to international organizations-----	1,800,000	1,600,000	-200,000	-----
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE					
LEGAL ACTIVITIES AND GENERAL ADMINISTRATION					
S. Doc. 91-67	Fees and expenses of witnesses-----	500,000			+500,000
IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE					
91-272	Salaries and expenses-----	892,000	892,000		-----
FEDERAL PRISON SYSTEM					
S. Doc. 91-67	Support of United States prisoners-----	850,000	850,000		+850,000
	Total, Department of Justice-----	2,242,000	892,000		+1,350,000
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE					
BUREAU OF THE CENSUS					
91-272	Nineteenth decennial census-----	11,000,000	11,000,000		-----
OFFICE OF FIELD SERVICES					
91-272	Salaries and expenses-----	105,000	105,000		
MARITIME ADMINISTRATION					
S. Doc. 91-67	State marine schools-----	145,000	145,000		+145,000
	Total, Department of Commerce-----	11,250,000	11,105,000		+145,000

**COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS
RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL—Continued**

TITLE I—GENERAL SUPPLEMENTALS—Continued

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimate	Recommended in House bill	Amount recom- mended by Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (-), Senate bill compared with—	
					Budget estimate	House bill
	CHAPTER X—Continued					
	THE JUDICIARY					
	CUSTOMS COURT					
91-272	Salaries and expenses.....	\$60,500	\$18,000	\$18,000	—\$42,500	-----
	COURTS OF APPEALS, DISTRICT COURTS, AND OTHER JUDICIAL SERVICES					
91-272	Salaries and expenses, United States magistrates.....	560,000	550,000	550,000	—10,000	-----
91-272	Salaries of supporting personnel.....	145,000	-----	-----	—145,000	-----
	Fees and expenses of court-appointed counsel:					
91-272	1970.....	1,150,000	1,150,000	1,150,000	-----	-----
91-273	1969.....	300,000	300,000	300,000	-----	-----
91-272	Fees of jurors and commissioners.....	800,000	500,000	500,000	—300,000	-----
91-272	Travel and miscellaneous expenses.....	625,000	500,000	500,000	—125,000	-----
91-272	Administrative Office of the United States Courts.....	50,000	15,000	15,000	—35,000	-----
91-272	Expenses of referees.....	34,000	-----	-----	—34,000	-----
	Total, courts of appeals, district courts, and other judicial services.....	3,664,000	3,015,000	3,015,000	—649,000	-----

Total, the Judiciary:					
	1970.....	3,424,500	2,733,000	2,733,000	-691,500
	1969.....	300,000	300,000	300,000	-----
	Total.....	3,724,500	3,033,000	3,033,000	-691,500
RELATED AGENCIES					
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE					
OFFICE OF EDUCATION					
91-272	Civil rights education.....	10,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	-5,000,000
SPECIAL REPRESENTATIVE FOR TRADE NEGOTIATIONS					
91-272	Salaries and expenses.....	60,000	-----	-----	-60,000
	Total, related agencies.....	10,060,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	-5,060,000
	Total, chapter X:				
New budget (obligational) authority:					
	1969.....	300,000	300,000	300,000	-----
	1970.....	28,776,500	21,330,000	22,825,000	-5,951,500
	Total.....	29,076,500	21,630,000	23,125,000	-5,951,500
CHAPTER XI					
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION					
COAST GUARD					
91-306	Retired pay.....	1,250,000	1,250,000	1,000,000	-250,000
RELATED AGENCY					
WASHINGTON METROPOLITAN AREA TRANSIT AUTHORITY					
91-272	Federal Contribution.....	82,939,000	82,939,000	82,939,000	-----
	Total, Chapter XI, new budget (obligational) authority.....	84,189,000	84,189,000	83,939,000	-250,000

**COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS
RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL—Continued**

TITLE I—GENERAL SUPPLEMENTALS—Continued

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimate	Recommended in House bill	Amount recom- mended by Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (-), Senate bill compared with—	
					Budget estimate	House bill
S. Doc. 91-67	CHAPTER XII TREASURY DEPARTMENT					
	BUREAU OF ACCOUNTS					
	Salaries and expenses.....	\$1,320,000		\$1,300,000	-\$20,000	+\$1,300,000
91-272 and S. Doc. 91-67	BUREAU OF THE PUBLIC DEBT					
	Administering the Public Debt.....	3,600,000	\$3,250,000	3,600,000		+350,000
	Total, Treasury Department.....	4,920,000	3,250,000	4,900,000	-20,000	+1,650,000
91-272	POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT					
	(Out of Postal Fund)					
	Transportation.....	10,700,000	10,700,000	10,600,000	-100,000	-100,000

91-272	INDEPENDENT AGENCY TAX COURT OF THE UNITED STATES					
	Salaries and expenses-----	83, 000	83, 000	67, 000	-16, 000	-16, 000
	Total, Chapter XII, new budget (obligational) authority-----	15, 703, 000	14, 033, 000	15, 567, 000	-136, 000	+1, 534, 000
91-315 and S. Doc. 91-86	CHAPTER XIII CLAIMS AND JUDGMENTS					
	Claims and judgments-----	23, 478, 461	6, 591, 406	23, 478, 461	-----	+16, 887, 055
	Total, Title I--General Supplementals:					
	New budget (obligational) authority:					
	1969-----	13, 916, 000	13, 916, 000	13, 916, 000	-----	-----
	1970-----	2, 187, 476, 116	1, 490, 460, 961	2, 134, 253, 604	-53, 222, 422	+643, 783, 733
	Total-----	2, 201, 392, 116	1, 504, 385, 961	2, 148, 169, 604	-53, 222, 422	+643, 783, 733
	New annual contract authorizations, increase in limitations-----	(55, 500, 000)	(75, 000, 000)	(75, 000, 000)	(+19, 500, 000)	-----
	By transfer-----	(7, 203, 000)	(7, 203, 000)	(7, 276, 000)	(+173, 000)	(+173, 000)
	Limitation on administrative expenses-----	(10, 349, 000)	(10, 000, 000)	(10, 000, 000)	(-349, 000)	-----

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL

TITLES II AND III—INCREASED PAY COSTS

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimate	Recommended in House bill	Amount recom- mended by Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (-), Senate bill compared with—
					Budget estimate House bill
TITLE II					
LEGISLATIVE BRANCH					
SENATE					
91-272	Compensation of the Vice President and Senators.....	\$10,835	-----	\$10,835	-----
91-272	Salaries, Officers and Employees.....	3,705,216	-----	3,634,674	-----
91-272	Office of the Legislative Counsel of the Senate.....	39,120	-----	39,120	-----
Contingent expenses of the Senate:					
91-272	Senate policy committees.....	47,120	-----	47,120	-----
91-272	Automobiles and maintenance.....	4,140	-----	4,140	-----
91-272	Inquiries and investigations.....	662,515	-----	662,515	-----
91-272	Folding documents.....	4,660	-----	4,660	-----
91-272	Miscellaneous items.....	92,810	-----	92,810	-----
	Total, Senate.....	4,566,416	-----	4,495,874	-----
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES					
91-272	Office of the Speaker.....	11,640	-----	-----	-----
91-272	Office of the Parliamentarian.....	10,865	\$10,865	10,865	-----
91-272	Compilation of precedents of House of Representatives.....	1,330	1,330	1,330	-----
91-272	Office of the Chaplain.....	1,805	1,805	1,805	-----

91-272	Office of the Clerk.....	221,600	100,000	100,000	-121,600
91-272	Office of the Sergeant at Arms.....	296,500	250,000	250,000	-46,500
91-272	Office of the Doorkeeper.....	228,650	120,000	120,000	-108,650
91-272	Office of the Postmaster.....	62,900	62,900	62,900	-
91-272	Committee employees.....	750,000	700,000	700,000	-50,000
91-272	Special and minority employees:				
	Minority employees.....	5,845			-5,845
	House Democratic steering committee.....	1,310	1,310	1,310	-
	House Republican conference.....	1,310	1,310	1,310	-
	Majority leader.....	8,135	8,135	8,135	-
	Minority leader.....	7,265	7,265	7,265	-
	Majority whip.....	5,525	5,525	5,525	-
	Minority whip.....	5,525	5,525	5,525	-
	Printing clerks.....	1,885			-1,885
	Technical assistant in the office of the attending physician.....	1,695			-1,695
91-272	Official reporters of debates.....	32,605	32,605	32,605	-
91-272	Official reporters to committees.....	32,370	32,370	32,370	-
91-272	Committee on Appropriations (investigations).....	89,445	89,445	89,445	-
91-272	Office of the legislative counsel.....	46,800	23,400	23,400	-23,400
91-272	Members' clerk hire.....	1,000,000	850,000	850,000	-150,000
91-272	Contingent expenses of the House:				
and	Government contributions.....	760,000	760,000	760,000	-
91-306	Speaker's automobile.....	1,500	1,500	1,500	-
	Majority leader's automobile.....	1,500	1,500	1,500	-
	Minority leader's automobile.....	1,500	1,500	1,500	-
	Total, House of Representatives.....	3,589,505	3,068,290	3,068,290	-521,215

**COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS
RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL—Continued**

TITLES II AND III—INCREASED PAY COSTS—Continued

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimate	Recommended in House bill	Amount recom- mended by Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (-), Senate bill compared with—	
					Budget estimate	House bill
	TITLE II—Continued					
	LEGISLATIVE BRANCH—Continued					
	JOINT ITEMS					
91-272	Joint Committee on Reduction of Federal Expenditures.....	\$5,725			-\$5,725	
91-272	Contingent expenses of the Senate:					
	Joint Economic Committee.....	44,490	\$44,490	\$43,475	-1,015	-\$1,015
	Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.....	32,460	32,460	32,460		
	Joint Committee on Printing.....	22,175	15,175	15,175	-7,000	
91-272	Contingent expenses of the House:					
	Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation.....	60,065	10,065	10,065	-50,000	
	Joint Committee on Defense Production.....	10,850	10,850	10,850		
	Total, joint items.....	175,765	113,040	112,025	-63,740	-1,015
	ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL					
91-272	Office of the Architect of the Capitol: Salaries.....	63,000	56,000	56,000	-7,000	
91-272	Capitol buildings and grounds:					
	Capitol buildings.....	70,500	55,500	55,500	-15,000	

91-272	Capitol grounds.....	28, 200	28, 200	-----	-----
91-272	Senate Office Buildings.....	146, 300	146, 300	-----	+146, 300
	Senate Garage.....	3, 400	3, 400	-----	+3, 400
	House office buildings.....	155, 500	120, 000	-----	-----
	Capitol power plant.....	20, 800	20, 800	-----	-----
91-272	Library buildings and grounds: Structural and mechanical care.....	25, 600	10, 000	-----	-----
	Total, Architect of the Capitol.....	513, 300	290, 500	-----	+149, 700
91-272	BOTANIC GARDEN			-----	-----
	Salaries and expenses.....	24, 000	24, 000	-----	-----
91-272	LIBRARY OF CONGRESS			-----	-----
	Salaries and expenses.....	1, 321, 500	1, 313, 500	-----	-----
91-272	Copyright Office: Salaries and expenses.....	274, 000	274, 000	-----	-----
91-272	Legislative Reference Service: Salaries and expenses.....	414, 000	414, 000	-----	-----
91-272	Distribution of catalog cards: Salaries and expenses.....	359, 000	1 159, 000	-----	-----
91-272	Books for the blind and physically handicapped: Salaries and expenses.....	56, 000	33, 000	-----	-----
91-272	Organizing and microfilming the papers of the Presidents: Salaries and expenses.....	13, 200	13, 200	-----	-----
91-272	Collection and distribution of library materials (special foreign currency program).....	16, 000	14, 000	-----	-----
	Total, Library of Congress.....	2, 453, 700	2, 220, 700	-----	-----
91-272	GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE			-----	-----
	Office of Superintendent of Documents: Salaries and expenses.....	495, 400	1 395, 400	-----	-----
91-272	GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE			-----	-----
	Salaries and expenses.....	5, 142, 000	5, 142, 000	-----	-----
	Total, legislative branch: New budget (obligational) authority.....	16, 960, 086	11, 253, 930	-----	+4, 644, 559

See footnotes at end of table.

**COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS
RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL—Continued**

TITLES II AND III—INCREASED PAY COSTS—Continued

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimate	Recommended in House bill	Amount recom- mended by Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (-), Senate bill compared with—	
					Budget estimate	House bill
	TITLE II—Continued					
	THE JUDICIARY					
	SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES					
91-272	Salaries.....	\$194, 000	\$194, 000	\$194, 000		
91-272	Care of the buildings and grounds.....	21, 700	21, 700	21, 700		
	Total, Supreme Court of the United States.....	215, 700	215, 700	215, 700		
	COURT OF CUSTOMS AND PATENT APPEALS					
91-272	Salaries and expenses.....	32, 000	22, 000	22, 000	—\$10, 000	
91-272	Salaries and expenses.....	128, 500	128, 500	128, 500		
91-272	Salaries and expenses.....	73, 000			—73, 000	
	COURTS OF APPEALS, DISTRICT COURTS, AND OTHER JUDICIAL SERVICES					
91-272	Salaries of supporting personnel.....	4, 670, 000	4, 370, 000	4, 370, 000	—300, 000	
91-272	Administrative Office of the United States Courts.....	170, 000	170, 000	170, 000		
	By transfer.....	(20, 000)	(20, 000)	(20, 000)		

91-272	Salaries of referees.....	14,500			14,500
91-272	Expenses of referees.....	608,000	608,000		608,000
	Total, Courts of appeals, district courts, and other judicial services.....	5,462,500	5,148,000	5,148,000	-314,500
	Total, the Judiciary: New budget (obligational) authority.....	5,911,700	5,514,200	5,514,200	-397,500
	<i>By transfer.....</i>	(20,000)	(20,000)	(20,000)	
	EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT				
	THE WHITE HOUSE OFFICE				
91-272	Salaries and expenses.....	310,000	310,000	310,000	
	EXECUTIVE MANSION				
91-272	Operating expenses.....	48,000	48,000	48,000	
	BUREAU OF THE BUDGET				
91-272	Salaries and expenses.....	491,000	491,000	491,000	
	COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS				
91-272	Salaries and expenses.....	50,000	50,000	50,000	
	NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE COUNCIL				
91-272	Salaries and expenses.....	49,000	49,000	49,000	
	OFFICE OF EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS				
91-272	Salaries and expenses.....	290,000	290,000	290,000	
	SPECIAL REPRESENTATIVE FOR TRADE NEGOTIATIONS				
91-272	Salaries and expenses.....	51,000	51,000	51,000	
	Total, Executive Office of the President: New budget (obligational) authority.....	1,289,000	1,289,000	1,289,000	

**COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS
RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL—Continued**

TITLES II AND III—INCREASED PAY COSTS—Continued

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimate	Recommended in House bill	Amount recom- mended by Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (-), Senate bill compared with—	
					Budget estimate	House bill
TITLE II—Continued						
FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT						
PEACE CORPS						
91-272	Salaries and expenses (<i>Increase in limitation on administrative expenses</i>).....	(\$1, 651, 000)	(\$1, 651, 000)	(\$1, 651, 000)		
FOREIGN ASSISTANCE						
ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE						
91-272	Administrative expenses (<i>by transfer</i>).....	(3, 200, 000)	(3, 200, 000)	(3, 200, 000)		
91-272	Administrative and other expenses (<i>by transfer</i>).....	(\$14, 000)	(200, 000)	(200, 000)	(- \$14, 000)	
Total, funds appropriated to the President:						
	<i>By transfer</i>	(3, 414, 000)	(3, 400, 000)	(3, 400, 000)	(- 14, 000)	
	<i>Increase in limitation on administrative expenses</i>	(1, 651, 000)	(1, 651, 000)	(1, 651, 000)		
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE						
AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH SERVICE						
91-272	Salaries and expenses.....	13, 661, 000	13, 500, 000	13, 500, 000	- 161, 000	
COOPERATIVE STATE RESEARCH SERVICE						
91-272	Payments and expenses.....	138, 000	130, 000	130, 000	- 8, 000	

91-272	FEDERAL EXTENSION SERVICE					
	Cooperative extension work, payments and expenses.....	250,000	250,000	250,000		
91-272	FARMER COOPERATIVE SERVICE					
	Salaries and expenses.....	131,000	131,000	131,000		
91-272	SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE					
	Conservation operations.....	9,450,000	9,450,000	9,450,000		
91-272	River basin surveys and investigations.....	652,000	652,000	652,000		
91-272	Watershed planning.....	491,000	491,000	491,000		
91-272	Watershed works of improvement.....	2,159,000	2,159,000	2,159,000		
91-272	Flood prevention.....	815,000	815,000	815,000		
91-272	Great Plains conservation program.....	342,000	342,000	342,000		
91-272	Resource conservation and development.....	573,000	573,000	573,000		
	Total, Soil Conservation Service.....	14,482,000	14,482,000	14,482,000		
91-272	ECONOMIC RESEARCH SERVICE					
	Salaries and expenses.....	1,142,000	1,142,000	1,142,000		
91-272	STATISTICAL REPORTING SERVICE					
	Salaries and expenses.....	1,116,000	1,116,000	1,116,000		
91-272	CONSUMER AND MARKETING SERVICE					
	Consumer protective, marketing, and regulatory programs.....	6,286,000	5,250,000	5,250,000	-1,036,000	
91-272	FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL SERVICE					
	Salaries and expenses.....	630,000	600,000	600,000	-30,000	
91-272	COMMODITY EXCHANGE AUTHORITY					
	Salaries and expenses.....	170,000	170,000	170,000		

**COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS
RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL—Continued**

TITLES II AND III—INCREASED PAY COSTS—Continued

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimate	Recommended in House bill	Amount recom- mended by Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (-), Senate bill compared with—	
					Budget estimate	House bill
	TITLE II—Continued					
	DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE—Continued					
	AGRICULTURAL STABILIZATION AND CONSERVATION SERVICE					
91-272	Expenses, Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service.....	\$6,000,000	\$6,000,000	\$6,000,000		
91-272	<i>By transfer</i>	(1,899,000)	(1,899,000)	(1,899,000)	-\$90,000	
91-272	OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL	1,022,000	1,022,000	1,022,000		
	Salaries and expenses.....					
91-272	PACKERS AND STOCKYARDS ADMINISTRATION	154,000	154,000	154,000		
	Salaries and expenses.....					
91-272	OFFICE OF THE GENERAL COUNSEL	427,000	427,000	427,000		
	Salaries and expenses.....					
91-272	OFFICE OF INFORMATION	150,000	150,000	150,000		
	Salaries and expenses.....					
91-272	NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL LIBRARY	175,000	175,000	175,000		
	Salaries and expenses.....					
91-272	OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT SERVICES	237,000	237,000	237,000		
	Salaries and expenses.....					

91-272	GENERAL ADMINISTRATION	Salaries and expenses	438,000	425,000	425,000	-13,000
	RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION					
91-272	FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION	Salaries and expenses	1,075,000	1,075,000	1,075,000	
91-272	FOREST SERVICE	Salaries and expenses	5,365,000	5,200,000	5,200,000	-165,000
91-272	Forest protection and utilization		10,266,000	10,266,000	10,266,000	
	FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE CORPORATION					
91-272	Administrative and operating expenses (<i>By transfer</i>)		(691,000)	(691,000)	(691,000)	
	Total, Department of Agriculture:					
	New Budget (obligational) authority		63,405,000	61,902,000	61,902,000	-1,503,000
	<i>By transfer</i>		(2,590,000)	(2,590,000)	(2,590,000)	
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE						
91-272	GENERAL ADMINISTRATION	Salaries and expenses	604,000	604,000	604,000	
	OFFICE OF BUSINESS ECONOMICS					
91-272	BUREAU OF THE CENSUS	Salaries and expenses	238,000	238,000	238,000	
91-272		Salaries and expenses	1,141,000	1,141,000	1,141,000	
	Nineteenth Decennial Census		6,722,000	6,722,000	6,722,000	
91-272	1947 economic censuses		282,000	282,000	282,000	
	Total, Bureau of the Census		8,145,000	8,145,000	8,145,000	

**COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS
RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL—Continued**

TITLES II AND III—INCREASED PAY COSTS—Continued

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimate	Recommended in House bill	Amount recom- mended by Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (-), Senate bill compared with—	
					Budget estimate	House bill
	TITLE II—Continued					
	DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE—Continued					
	ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION					
91-272	Planning, technical assistance and research.....	\$79,000				
91-272	Operations and administration.....	1,121,000	\$1,121,000	\$1,121,000		
	Total, Economic Development Administration.....	1,200,000	1,121,000	1,121,000		
91-272	BUSINESS AND DEFENSE SERVICES ADMINISTRATION	505,000	505,000	505,000		
	Salaries and expenses.....					
91-272	INTERNATIONAL ACTIVITIES	835,000	835,000	835,000		
	Salaries and expenses.....	446,000	446,000	446,000		
91-272	Export control.....					
	Total, International activities.....	1,281,000	1,281,000	1,281,000		
91-272	OFFICE OF FIELD SERVICES	389,000	389,000	389,000		
	Salaries and expenses.....					
91-272	MINORITY BUSINESS ENTERPRISE	94,000	94,000	94,000		
	Salaries and expenses.....					
91-272	FOREIGN DIRECT INVESTMENT CONTROL	100,000	100,000	100,000		
	Salaries and expenses.....					

**COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS
RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL—Continued**

TITLES II AND III—INCREASED PAY COSTS—Continued

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimate	Recommended in House bill	Amount recom- mended by Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (-), Senate bill compared with—	
					Budget estimate	House bill
TITLE II—Continued						
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—MILITARY—Continued						
MILITARY PERSONNEL—Continued						
91-272	National Guard personnel, Army.....	\$33,900,000	\$33,500,000	\$33,500,000	—\$400,000	-----
91-272	National Guard personnel, Air Force.....	10,300,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	—300,000	-----
	Total, military personnel.....	1,655,900,000	1,582,700,000	1,600,200,000	—55,700,000	+ \$17,500,000
RETIRED MILITARY PERSONNEL						
91-272	Retired pay, Defense.....	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000		-----
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE						
91-272	Operation and maintenance, Army.....	206,900,000	196,480,000	206,900,000		+10,420,000
91-272	Operation and maintenance, Navy.....	166,100,000	157,800,000	166,100,000		+ 8,300,000
91-272	Operation and maintenance, Marine Corps.....	7,400,000	7,000,000	7,000,000	—400,000	-----
91-272	Operation and maintenance, Air Force.....	88,600,000	84,200,000	84,200,000	—4,400,000	-----
91-272	Operation and maintenance, Defense agencies.....	74,200,000	70,400,000	74,200,000		+3,800,000
91-272	Operation and maintenance, Army National Guard.....	14,800,000	13,800,000	14,800,000		+1,000,000
91-272	Operation and maintenance, Air National Guard.....	13,000,000	12,250,000	12,250,000	—750,000	-----
91-272	Court of Military Appeals.....	71,000	70,000	70,000	—1,000	-----
	Total, operation and maintenance.....	571,071,000	542,000,000	565,520,000	—5,551,000	+23,520,000

91-272	CIVIL DEFENSE	Operation and maintenance	850,000	850,000	850,000		
		Total, Department of Defense—Military:					
		New budget (obligational) authority	2,252,821,000	2,150,550,000	2,191,570,000	-61,251,000	+41,020,000
		DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL					
		DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY					
		CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL					
91-272		Operation and maintenance, general	6,905,000	6,905,000	6,905,000		
91-272		General expenses	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000		
		Total, Corps of Engineers—Civil	8,905,000	8,905,000	8,905,000		
91-272		ADMINISTRATION					
		RYUKYU ISLANDS, ARMY	200,000	200,000	200,000	-9,000	
		UNITED STATES SOLDIERS' HOME					
91-272		Operation and maintenance	296,000	296,000	296,000		
		Total, Department of the Army	9,410,000	9,401,000	9,401,000	-9,000	
		THE PANAMA CANAL					
		CANAL ZONE GOVERNMENT					
91-272		Operating expenses	963,000	963,000	963,000		
		PANAMA CANAL COMPANY FUND					
91-272		Limitation on general and administrative expenses	(605,000)	(605,000)	(605,000)		
		Total, Department of Defense—Civil:					
		New budget (obligational) authority	10,373,000	10,364,000	10,364,000	-9,000	
		Limitation on general and administrative expenses	(605,000)	(605,000)	(605,000)		

**COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS
RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL—Continued**

TITLES II AND III—INCREASED PAY COSTS—Continued

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimate	Recommended in House bill	Amount recom- mended by Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (-), Senate bill compared with—	
					Budget estimate	House bill
TITLE II—Continued						
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE						
CONSUMER PROTECTION AND ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH SERVICE						
91-272	Food and drug control (<i>by transfer</i>)	(\$2,294,000)	(\$2,294,000)	(\$2,294,000)		
91-272	Air pollution control (<i>by transfer</i>)	(1,062,000)	(1,062,000)	(1,062,000)		
91-272	Environmental control (<i>by transfer</i>)	(757,000)	(757,000)	(757,000)		
91-272	Office of the Administrator, Salaries and expenses (<i>by transfer</i>)	(354,000)	(354,000)	(354,000)		
	Total, Consumer Protection and Environmental Health Service (<i>by transfer</i>)	(4,467,000)	(4,467,000)	(4,467,000)		
HEALTH SERVICES AND MENTAL HEALTH ADMINISTRATION						
91-272	Mental health (<i>by transfer</i>)	(358,000)	(358,000)	(358,000)		
91-272	Saint Elizabeths Hospital (<i>by transfer</i>)	(2,519,000)	(2,519,000)	(2,519,000)		
91-272	Communicable diseases (<i>by transfer</i>)	(2,446,000)	(2,446,000)	(2,446,000)		
91-272	Hospital construction (<i>by transfer</i>)	(208,000)	(208,000)	(208,000)		
91-272	Patient care and special health services (<i>by transfer</i>)	(5,241,000)	(5,241,000)	(5,241,000)		
91-272	National health statistics (<i>by transfer</i>)	(329,000)	(329,000)	(329,000)		

91-272	Indian health services (<i>by transfer</i>)	(4,464,000)	(4,464,000)	(4,464,000)	
91-272	Office of the Administrator, salaries and expenses (<i>by transfer</i>)	(691,000)	(691,000)	(691,000)	
	Total Health Services and Mental Health Administration (<i>by transfer</i>)	(16,256,000)	(16,256,000)	(16,256,000)	
91-272	NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH	(218,000)	(218,000)	(218,000)	
	Office of the Director, salaries and expenses (<i>by transfer</i>)				
	OFFICE OF EDUCATION				
91-272	School assistance in federally affected areas (<i>by transfer</i>)	(14,000)	(14,000)	(14,000)	
91-272	Libraries and community services (<i>by transfer</i>)	(300,000)	(300,000)	(300,000)	
91-272	Salaries and expenses (<i>by transfer</i>)	(2,528,000)	(2,528,000)	(2,528,000)	
	Total, Office of Education (<i>by transfer</i>)	(2,842,000)	(2,842,000)	(2,842,000)	
	SOCIAL AND REHABILITATION SERVICE				
91-272	Salaries and expenses (<i>by transfer</i>)	(2,496,000)	(2,496,000)	(2,496,000)	
91-272	Assistance to refugees in the United States (<i>by transfer</i>)	(94,000)	(90,000)	(90,000)	(- \$4,000)
	Total, Social and Rehabilitation Service (<i>by transfer</i>)	(2,590,000)	(2,586,000)	(2,586,000)	(-4,000)
91-272	SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION	(21,276,000)	(21,276,000)	(21,276,000)	
	Limitation on salaries and expenses (<i>trust fund</i>)				
	SPECIAL INSTITUTIONS				
91-272	Model Secondary School for the Deaf, salaries and expenses (<i>by transfer</i>)	(12,000)	(12,000)	(12,000)	
91-272	Gallaudet College, salaries and expenses (<i>by transfer</i>)	(162,000)	(162,000)	(162,000)	
91-272	Howard University, salaries and expenses (<i>by transfer</i>)	(664,000)	(664,000)	(664,000)	
91-272	Freedmen's Hospital (<i>by transfer</i>)	(766,000)	(766,000)	(766,000)	
	Total, special institutions (<i>by transfer</i>)	(1,604,000)	(1,604,000)	(1,604,000)	
91-272	DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT	(451,000)	(451,000)	(451,000)	
	Office of the Secretary, salaries and expenses (<i>by transfer</i>)				

**COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS
RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL—Continued**

TITLES II AND III—INCREASED PAY COSTS—Continued

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimate	Recommended in House bill	Amount recom- mended by Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (-), Senate bill compared with—	
					Budget estimate	House bill
TITLE II—Continued						
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—Continued						
DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT—Continued						
91-272	Office for Civil Rights, salaries and expenses (<i>by transfer</i>).....	(\$496,000)	(\$496,000)	(\$496,000)		
91-272	Office of Community and Field Services, salaries and expenses (<i>by transfer</i>).....	(607,000)	(607,000)	(607,000)		
91-272	Office of the Comptroller, salaries and expenses (<i>by transfer</i>).....	(1,018,000)	(1,018,000)	(1,018,000)		
91-272	Office of the Administrator, salaries and expenses (<i>by transfer</i>).....	(476,000)	(476,000)	(476,000)		
91-272	Surplus property utilization (<i>by transfer</i>).....	(107,000)	(107,000)	(107,000)		
91-272	Office of the General Counsel, salaries and expenses (<i>by transfer</i>).....	(337,000)	(337,000)	(337,000)		
	Total, Departmental Management (<i>by transfer</i>).....	(\$3,492,000)	(\$3,492,000)	(\$3,492,000)		
	Total, Department of Health, Education and Welfare:					
	<i>By transfer</i>	(31,469,000)	(31,465,000)	(31,465,000)		(—\$4,000)
	<i>Limitation on salaries and expenses (trust fund)</i>	(21,276,000)	(21,276,000)	(21,276,000)		
DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT						
RENEWAL AND HOUSING ASSISTANCE						
91-272	Salaries and expenses.....	2,640,000	2,508,000	2,508,000		—132,000
METROPOLITAN DEVELOPMENT						
91-272	Salaries and expenses.....	506,000	480,700	480,700		—25,300

MODEL CITIES AND GOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS					
91-272	Salaries and expenses	29,000	27,600	27,600	-1,400
	(By transfer)	(422,000)	(400,900)	(400,900)	(-21,100)
FEDERAL INSURANCE ADMINISTRATION					
91-272	Flood insurance	30,000	28,500	28,500	-1,500
91-272	Fair housing and equal opportunity	412,000	391,400	391,400	-20,600
DEPARTMENT MANAGEMENT					
91-272	General Administration	589,000	559,500	559,500	-29,500
91-272	Regional management and services	690,000	655,000	655,000	-35,000
	Total, Department Management	1,279,000	1,214,500	1,214,500	-64,500
COLLEGE HOUSING LOANS					
91-272	Limitation on administrative expenses	(79,000)	(75,000)	(75,000)	(-4,000)
PUBLIC FACILITY LOANS					
91-272	Limitation on administrative expenses	(53,000)	(55,000)	(55,000)	(-2,000)
REVOLVING FUND (LIQUIDATING PROGRAMS)					
91-272	Limitation on administrative expenses	(7,000)	(6,700)	(6,700)	(-300)
FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION					
91-272	Limitation on administrative expenses	(450,000)	(450,000)	(450,000)	
91-272	Limitation on nonadministrative expenses	(6,175,000)	(5,175,000)	(5,175,000)	(-1,000,000)
Total, Department of Housing and Urban Development:					
	New budget (obligational) authority	4,896,000	4,650,700	4,650,700	-245,300
	By transfer	(422,000)	(400,900)	(400,900)	(-21,100)
	Limitations on administrative expenses	(6,769,000)	(5,761,700)	(5,761,700)	(-1,007,300)

**COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS
RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL—Continued**

TITLES II AND III—INCREASED PAY COSTS—Continued

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimate	Recommended in House bill	Amount recom- mended by Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (-), Senate bill compared with—	
					Budget estimate	House bill
	TITLE II—Continued					
	DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR					
	BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT					
91-272	Management of lands and resources.....	\$3,498,000	\$3,498,000	\$3,498,000		
	BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS					
91-272	Education and welfare services.....	9,799,000	9,799,000	9,799,000		
91-272	Resources management.....	4,378,000	4,378,000	4,378,000		
91-272	General administrative expenses.....	513,000	500,000	500,000	-\$13,000	
	Total, Bureau of Indian Affairs.....	14,690,000	14,677,000	14,677,000	-13,000	
	BUREAU OF OUTDOOR RECREATION					
91-272	Salaries and expenses.....	275,000	200,000	200,000	-75,000	
	GEOLOGICAL SURVEY					
91-272	Surveys, investigations, and research.....	3,310,000	3,310,000	3,310,000		
	BUREAU OF MINES					
91-272	Conservation and development of mineral resources.....	3,164,000	3,164,000	3,164,000		
91-272	Health and safety.....	1,120,000	1,120,000	1,120,000		

**COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS
RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL—Continued**

TITLES II AND III—INCREASED PAY COSTS—Continued

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimate	Recommended in House bill	Amount recom- mended by Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (-), Senate bill compared with—		
					Budget estimate	House bill	
	TITLE II—Continued						
	DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR—Continued						
	BUREAU OF RECLAMATION						
91-272	General investigations.....	\$900,000	\$900,000	\$900,000			
91-272	Operation and maintenance.....	1,870,000	1,870,000	1,870,000			
91-272	General administrative expenses.....	970,000	970,000	970,000			
	Total, Bureau of Reclamation.....	3,740,000	3,740,000	3,740,000			
	BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION						
91-272	Operation and maintenance.....	800,000	800,000	800,000			
	SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION						
91-272	Operation and maintenance.....	24,000			—\$24,000		
	SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION						
91-272	Operation and maintenance.....	155,000	155,000	155,000			
	OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR						
91-272	Salaries and expenses.....	474,000	374,000	374,000	—100,000		
	OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY						
91-272	Salaries and expenses.....	802,000	702,000	702,000	—100,000		

91-272	OFFICE OF WATER RESOURCES RESEARCH	52,000	52,000	52,000	
	Salaries and expenses.....				
	Total, Department of the Interior:				
	New budget (obligational) authority.....	42,182,000	41,810,000	41,810,000	-372,000
	Limitation on administrative expenses.....	(25,000)	(25,000)	(25,000)	
	DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE				
	LEGAL ACTIVITIES AND GENERAL ADMINISTRATION				
91-272	Salaries and expenses, general administration.....	634,000	634,000	634,000	
91-272	Salaries and expenses, general legal activities.....	2,264,000	2,264,000	2,264,000	
91-272	Salaries and expenses, Antitrust Division.....	769,000	769,000	769,000	
91-272	Salaries and expenses, United States attorneys and marshals.....	3,824,000	3,824,000	3,824,000	
91-272	Salaries and expenses, Community Relations Service.....	230,000	230,000	230,000	
	Total, Legal Activities and General Administration.....	7,721,000	7,721,000	7,721,000	
	FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION				
91-272	Salaries and expenses.....	17,455,000	17,455,000	17,455,000	
	IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE				
91-272	Salaries and expenses.....	7,452,000	7,452,000	7,452,000	
	FEDERAL PRISON SYSTEM				
91-272	Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Prisons.....	5,109,000	5,109,000	5,109,000	
	FEDERAL PRISON INDUSTRIES, INCORPORATED				
S. Doc. 91-67	Limitation on Administrative and Vocational Training Expenses, Federal Prison Industries, Incorporated (increase in limitation on administrative expenses).....	(55,000)		(55,000)	(+355 000)

**COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS
RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL—Continued**

TITLES II AND III—INCREASED PAY COSTS—Continued

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimate	Recommended in House bill	Amount recom- mended by Senate committee	Budget estimate	Increase (+) or decrease (-), Senate bill compared with—
					House bill	
	TITLE II—Continued					
	DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE—Continued					
	BUREAU OF NARCOTICS AND DANGEROUS DRUGS					
91-272	Salaries and expenses.....	\$1, 530, 000	\$1, 530, 000	\$1, 530, 000		
	Total, Department of Justice:					
	New budget (obligational) authority.....	39, 267, 000	39, 267, 000	39, 267, 000		
	<i>Limitation on administrative expenses.</i>	(55, 000)		(55, 000)		(+\$55, 000)
	DEPARTMENT OF LABOR					
	MANPOWER ADMINISTRATION					
91-272	Manpower development and training activities.....	45, 000	45, 000	45, 000		
91-272	<i>By transfer.</i>	(100, 000)	(100, 000)	(100, 000)		
91-272	Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training, salaries and expenses.....	343, 000	343, 000	343, 000		
91-272	Bureau of Employment Security, salaries and expenses (<i>limitation on administrative expenses</i>).....	(1, 408, 000)	(1, 408, 000)	(1, 408, 000)		
	Total, Manpower Administration.....	388, 000	388, 000	388, 000		
	<i>By transfer.</i>	(100, 000)	(100, 000)	(100, 000)		
	<i>Limitation on administrative expenses.</i>	(1, 408, 000)	(1, 408, 000)	(1, 408, 000)		

LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS			
91-272	Labor-Management Services Administration, salaries and expenses.....	805, 000	805, 000
	WAGE AND LABOR STANDARDS		
91-272	Wage and Labor Standards Administration, salaries and expenses.....	713, 000	713, 000
91-272	Wage and Hour Division, salaries and expenses.....	1, 440, 000	1, 440, 000
	Total, Wage and Labor Standards.....	2, 153, 000	2, 153, 000
	BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS		
91-272	Salaries and expenses.....	1, 693, 000	1, 693, 000
	BUREAU OF INTERNATIONAL LABOR AFFAIRS		
91-272	Salaries and expenses.....	130, 000	130, 000
	OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR		
91-272	Salaries and expenses.....	438, 000	438, 000
91-272	By transfer.....	(13, 000)	(13, 000)
	OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY		
91-272	Salaries and expenses.....	515, 000	515, 000
91-272	By transfer.....	(36, 000)	(36, 000)
91-272	Federal contract compliance and civil rights program, salaries and expenses.....	56, 000	56, 000
91-272	By transfer.....	(53, 000)	(53, 000)
	Total, Office of the Secretary: New budget (obligational) authority.....	571, 000	571, 000
	By transfer.....	(89, 000)	(89, 000)
	Total, Department of Labor:		
	New budget (obligational) authority.....	6, 178, 000	6, 178, 000
	By transfer.....	(302, 000)	(302, 000)
	Limitation on administrative expense.....	(1, 408, 000)	(1, 408, 000)

**COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS
RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL—Continued**

TITLES II AND III—INCREASED PAY COSTS—Continued

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimate	Recommended in House bill	Amount recom- mended by Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (-), Senate bill compared with—	
					Budget estimate	House bill
	TITLE II—Continued					
	POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT					
	(Out of Postal fund)					
91-272	Administration and regional operation.....	\$10,715,000	\$10,715,000	\$10,715,000		
91-272	Research, development, and engineering.....	898,000	898,000	898,000		
91-272	Operations.....	261,956,000	261,956,000	261,956,000		
91-272	Supplies and services.....	215,000	215,000	215,000		
	Total, Post Office Department: New budget (obligational) authority.	273,784,000	273,784,000	273,784,000		
	DEPARTMENT OF STATE					
	ADMINISTRATION OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS					
91-272	Salaries and expenses.....	13,400,000	13,400,000	13,400,000		
91-272	Acquisition, operation and maintenance of buildings abroad.....	177,000	177,000	177,000		
	INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND CONFERENCES					
91-272	Missions to international organizations.....	340,000	340,000	340,000		
	INTERNATIONAL COMMISSIONS					
91-272	International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico:					

91-272	Salaries and expenses.....	81,000	81,000	81,000	-----
	Operation and maintenance.....	175,000	175,000	175,000	-----
91-272	American sections, international commissions.....	42,000	42,000	42,000	-----
	International fisheries commissions.....	56,000	56,000	56,000	-----
	Total, international commissions.....	354,000	354,000	354,000	-----
	EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE				-----
91-272	Mutual educational and cultural exchange activities.....	700,000	700,000	700,000	-----
	OTHER				-----
91-272	Migration and refugee assistance.....	61,000	60,000	60,000	-----
	Total, Department of State:				-----
	New budget (obligational) authority.....	15,032,000	15,031,000	15,031,000	-----
	DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION				-----
	OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY				-----
91-272	Salaries and expenses.....	820,000	720,000	720,000	-----
	COAST GUARD				-----
91-272	Operating expenses.....	21,885,000	21,675,000	21,675,000	-----
91-272	Retired pay.....	350,000	-----	-----	-----
91-272	Reserve training.....	2,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	-----
	Total, Coast Guard.....	24,235,000	22,675,000	22,675,000	-----
	FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION				-----
91-272	Operations.....	58,597,000	58,597,000	58,597,000	-----
91-272	Operation and maintenance, National Capital airports.....	440,000	400,000	400,000	-----
	Total, Federal Aviation Administration.....	59,037,000	58,997,000	58,997,000	-----

**COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS
RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL—Continued**

TITLES II AND III—INCREASED PAY COSTS—Continued

II. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimate	Recommended in House bill	Amount recom- mended by Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (-), Senate bill compared with—	
					Budget estimate	House bill
TITLE II—Continued						
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION—Continued						
FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION						
91-272	Office of the administrator, salaries and expenses.....	\$132,000	\$132,000	\$132,000		
91-272	(By transfer).....	(941,000)	(941,000)	(941,000)		
91-272	Highway beautification.....	92,000			—\$92,000	
91-272	Traffic and highway safety.....	678,000	600,000	600,000		—78,000
91-272	Motor carrier safety.....	173,000	173,000	173,000		
91-272	Bureau of Public Roads, limitation on general expenses: <i>Increase in limitation on administrative expenses</i>	(3,681,000)	(3,081,000)	(3,081,000)		(—600,000)
	Total, Federal Highway Administration.....	1,075,000	905,000	905,000		—170,000
	<i>By transfer</i>	(941,000)	(941,000)	(941,000)		
	<i>Limitation on administrative expenses</i>	(3,681,000)	(3,081,000)	(3,081,000)		(—600,000)
FEDERAL RAILROAD ADMINISTRATION						
91-272	Office of the Administrator, salaries and expenses.....	85,000	85,000	85,000		
91-272	Bureau of railroad safety.....	304,000	270,000	270,000		—34,000
	Total, Federal Railroad Administration.....	389,000	355,000	355,000		—34,000

91-272	URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ADMINISTRATION	130,000	100,000	100,000	-30,000
	Salaries and expenses.....				
91-272	ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION	(52,000)	(52,000)	(52,000)	
	<i>Limitation on administrative expenses.....</i>				
91-272	NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD	365,000	350,000	350,000	-15,000
	Salaries and expenses.....				
	Total, Department of Transportation:				
	New budget (obligational) authority.....	86,051,000	84,102,000	84,102,000	-1,949,000
	By transfer.....	(941,000)	(941,000)	(941,000)	
	<i>Limitation on administrative expenses.....</i>	(3,733,000)	(3,133,000)	(3,133,000)	(-600,000)
	TREASURY DEPARTMENT				
	OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY				
91-272	Salaries and expenses.....	628,000	628,000	628,000	
	BUREAU OF ACCOUNTS				
91-272	Salaries and expenses.....	400,000	400,000	400,000	
	BUREAU OF CUSTOMS				
91-282	Salaries and expenses.....	8,830,000	8,830,000	8,830,000	
	BUREAU OF THE MINT				
91-272	Salaries and expenses.....	500,000	500,000	500,000	
	BUREAU OF THE PUBLIC DEBT				
91-273	Administering the public debt.....	1,444,000	1,444,000	1,444,000	
	INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE				
91-272	Salaries and expenses.....	1,846,000	1,846,000	1,846,000	
91-272	Revenue accounting and processing.....	11,920,000	11,920,000	11,920,000	
91-272	Compliance.....	46,291,000	46,291,000	46,291,000	
	Total, Internal Revenue Service.....	60,057,000	60,057,000	60,057,000	

**COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS
RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL—Continued**

TITLES II AND III—INCREASED PAY COSTS—Continued

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimate	Recommended in House bill	Amount recom- mended by Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (-), Senate bill compared with—	
					Budget estimate	House bill
TITLE II—Continued						
TREASURY DEPARTMENT—Continued						
OFFICE OF THE TREASURER						
91-272	Salaries and expenses	\$523, 000	\$523, 000	\$523, 000		
91-272 and S. Doc. 91-47	Salaries and expenses	1, 999, 000	1, 740, 000	1, 940, 000	—\$59, 000	+\$200, 000
	Total, Treasury Department:					
	New Budget (obligational) authority	74, 381, 000	74, 122, 000	74, 322, 000	—59, 000	+200, 000
ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION						
91-272	Operating expenses	6, 368, 000	5, 000, 000	5, 000, 000	—1, 368, 000	
GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION						
91-272	Operating expenses, Public Buildings Service	7, 222, 000	7, 222, 000	7, 222, 000		
91-272	Operating expenses, Federal Supply Service	4, 431, 000	4, 431, 000	4, 431, 000		
91-272	Operating expenses, National Archives and Records Service	1, 635, 000	1, 635, 000	1, 635, 000		
91-272	Operating expenses, Transportation and Communications Service	528, 000	528, 000	528, 000		

91-272	Operating expenses, Property Management and Disposal Service.....	796,000	796,000	796,000	-----
91-272	Salaries and expenses, Office of Administrator.....	71,000	71,000	71,000	-----
	Total, General Services Administration:				
	New budget (obligational) authority.....	14,683,000	14,683,000	14,683,000	-----
	NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION				
91-272	Research and program management.....	41,767,000	38,000,000	38,000,000	-----
	VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION				
91-272	Medical and prosthetic research.....	2,983,000	2,983,000	2,983,000	-----
91-272	Medical administration and miscellaneous operating expenses.....	955,000	955,000	955,000	-----
91-272	General operating expenses.....	15,835,000	15,835,000	15,835,000	-----
	Total, Veterans' Administration: New budget (obligational) authority.....	19,733,000	19,773,000	19,773,000	-----
	OTHER INDEPENDENT AGENCIES				
91-272	American Battle Monuments Commission: Salaries and expenses.....	77,000	77,000	77,000	-----
91-272	Civil Aeronautics Board: Salaries and expenses.....	910,000	900,000	900,000	-----
91-272	Civil Service Commission: Salaries and expenses.....	2,354,000	2,354,000	2,354,000	-----
91-272	Equal Employment Opportunity Commission: Salaries and expenses.....	900,000	900,000	900,000	-----
91-272	Export-Import Bank of the United States: Increase in limitation on administrative expenses.....	(439,000)	(400,000)	(400,000)	-----
91-272	Farm Credit Administration: Limitation on administrative expenses: Increase in limitation on administrative expenses.....	(215,000)	(215,000)	(215,000)	-----
91-272	Federal Communications Commission: Salaries and expenses.....	1,750,00	1,700,000	1,700,000	-----
91-272	Federal Field Committee for Development Planning in Alaska: Salaries and expenses.....	21,000	21,000	21,000	-----

**COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS
RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL—Continued**

TITLES II AND III—INCREASED PAY COSTS—Continued

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimate	Recommended in House bill	Amount recom- mended by Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (-), Senate bill compared with—	
					Budget estimate	House bill
TITLE II—Continued						
OTHER INDEPENDENT AGENCIES—Continued						
	Federal Home Loan Bank Board: Limitation on administrative and non-administrative expenses:					
91-272	<i>Increase in limitation on administrative expenses</i>	(\$412,000)	(\$412,000)	(\$412,000)		
91-272	<i>Increase in limitation in nonadministrative expenses</i>	(\$25,000)	(\$25,000)	(\$25,000)		
91-272	Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation: <i>Limitation on administrative expenses</i>	(24,000)	(24,000)	(24,000)		
91-272	Federal Maritime Commission: Salaries and expenses.....	328,000	228,000	228,000	—\$100,000	
91-272	Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service: Salaries and expenses.....	615,000	615,000	615,000		
91-272	Federal Power Commission: Salaries and expenses.....	1,336,000	1,300,000	1,300,000	—36,000	
91-272	Federal Radiation Council.....	8,000	8,000	8,000		
91-272	Federal Trade Commission.....	1,500,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	—500,000	
91-272	Foreign Claims Settlement Commission: Salaries and expenses.....	56,000	56,000	56,000		
91-272	Historical and Memorial Commissions: American Revolution Bicentennial Commission: Salaries and expenses.....	12,000	10,000	10,000	—2,000	
91-272	Inter-Agency Committee on Mexican-American Affairs: Salaries and expenses.....	27,000	27,000	27,000		

91-272	Intergovernmental Agencies: Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental relations: Salaries and expenses-----	45,000 (42,000)	45,000	45,000 (42,000)	(+ \$12,000)
91-272	Appalachian Regional Commission: Salaries and expenses (transfer)-----				
91-272	Interstate Commerce Commission: Salaries and expenses-----	1,975,000	1,900,000	1,900,000	-75,000
91-272	National Capital Planning Commission: Salaries and expenses-----	75,000	25,000	25,000	-50,000
91-272	National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities: Salaries and expenses-----				
91-272	National Labor Relations Board: Salaries and expenses-----	120,000	120,000	120,000	
91-272	National Mediation Board: Salaries and expenses-----	1,642,000	1,642,000	1,642,000	
91-272	President's Committee on Consumer Interests: Salaries and expenses-----	127,000	127,000	127,000	
91-272	Railroad Retirement Board: Limitation on salaries and expenses (increase in limitation on administrative expenses)-----	10,000	10,000	10,000	
91-272	Renegotiation Board: Salaries and expenses-----	(990,000)	(990,000)	(990,000)	
91-272	Securities and Exchange Commission: Salaries and expenses-----	110,000	110,000	110,000	
91-272	Small Business Administration: Salaries and expenses-----	1,200,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	-200,000
91-272	(By transfer)-----	808,000	808,000	808,000	
91-272	Smithsonian Institution: Salaries and expenses-----	(3,163,000)	(3,163,000)	(3,163,000)	
91-272	National Gallery of Art: Salaries and expenses-----	1,431,000	1,331,000	1,331,000	-100,000
91-272	Subversive Activities Control Board: Salaries and expenses-----	191,000	191,000	191,000	
91-272	Tariff Commission: Salaries and expenses-----	57,000	57,000	57,000	
91-272	Tax Court of the United States: Salaries and expenses-----	239,000	239,000	239,000	
91-272		140,000	140,000	140,000	

**COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS
RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL—Continued**

TITLES II AND III—INCREASED PAY COSTS—Continued

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimate	Recommended in House bill	Amount recom- mended by Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (-), Senate bill compared with—	
					Budget estimate	House bill
91-272	TITLE II—Continued					
	OTHER INDEPENDENT AGENCIES—Continued					
	United States Information Agency:					
	Salaries and expenses.....	\$6,883,000	\$6,883,000	\$6,883,000		
	Special international exhibitions.....	183,000	183,000	183,000		
	Total, other independent agencies: New budget (obligational) authority.....	25,130,000	24,007,000	24,007,000	-\$1,123,000	
	By transfer.....	(3,205,000)	(3,163,000)	(3,205,000)		(+\$42,000)
	Limitation on administrative expenses.....	(2,405,000)	(2,366,000)	(2,366,000)	(-39,000)	
	DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA					
	DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FUNDS					
91-272 and S. Doc. 91-82	General operating expenses.....	(2,229,000)	(1,932,000)	(2,229,000)		(+297,000)
91-272 and S. Doc. 91-82	Public safety.....	(2,324,000)	(1,780,000)	(2,324,000)		(+544,000)

91-272	Education.....	(966, 000)	(966, 000)	(966, 000)	-----
91-272 and S. Doc. 91-82	Parks and recreation.....	(899, 000)	(652, 000)	(899, 000)	(+247, 000)
91-272 and S. Doc. 91-82	Health and welfare.....	(4, 624, 000)	(4, 478, 000)	(4, 624, 000)	(+146, 000)
91-272	Highways and traffic.....	(600, 000)	(600, 000)	(600, 000)	-----
91-272 and S. Doc. 91-82	Sanitary engineering.....	(1, 905, 000)	(1, 096, 000)	(1, 905, 000)	(+809, 000)
	Total, District of Columbia funds.....	(13, 517, 000)	(11, 504, 000)	(13, 517, 000)	(+2, 013, 000)
	Total, title II:				
	New budget (obligational) authority.....	3, 028, 779, 786	2, 909, 729, 830	2, 955, 594, 389	+45, 864, 559
	By transfer.....	(42, 263, 000)	(42, 181, 900)	(42, 223, 900)	(+42, 000)
	Limitations on administrative and nonadministrative expenses.....	(37, 927, 000)	(36, 225, 700)	(36, 230, 700)	(+55, 000)
	TITLE III				
	Increased Pay Costs—Federal Employees Salary Act of 1970 (indefinite).....	2 1, 350, 000, 000	2 1, 350, 000, 000	2 1, 350, 000, 000	-----
	Grand total, titles II and III—Increased pay costs:				
	New budget (obligational) authority:				
	Definite.....	3, 028, 779, 786	2, 909, 729, 830	2, 955, 594, 389	+45, 864, 559
	Indefinite.....	2 1, 350, 000, 000	2 1, 350, 000, 000	2 1, 350, 000, 000	-----
	Total.....	4, 378, 779, 786	4, 259, 729, 830	4, 305, 594, 389	+45, 864, 559
	By transfer.....	(42, 263, 000)	(42, 181, 900)	(42, 223, 900)	(+42, 000)
	Limitations on administrative and nonadministrative expenses.....	(37, 927, 000)	(36, 225, 700)	(36, 230, 700)	(+55, 000)

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL—Continued

TITLES II AND III—INCREASED PAY COSTS—Continued

H. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimate	Recommended in House bill	Amount recom- mended by Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (-), Senate bill compared with—	
					Budget estimate	House bill
	TITLE III—Continued RECAPITULATION					
	Grand total, Titles I, II, and III:					
	New budget (obligational) authority:					
	Fiscal year 1969.....	\$13,916,000	\$13,916,000	\$13,916,000		
	Fiscal year 1970:					
	Definite.....	5,216,255,902	4,400,199,791	5,089,848,083	-\$126,407,819	+\$689,648,292
	Indefinite.....	1,350,000,000	1,350,000,000	1,350,000,000		
	Total, fiscal year 1970.....	6,566,255,902	5,750,199,791	6,439,848,083	-126,407,819	+689,648,292
	Total, new budget (obligational) authority.....	6,580,171,902	5,764,115,791	6,453,764,083	-126,407,819	+689,648,292
	New annual contract authorizations, increase in limitations.....	(55,500,000)	(75,000,000)	(75,000,000)	(+19,500,000)	
	By transfer.....	(49,466,000)	(49,384,900)	(49,599,900)	(+133,900)	(+215,000)
	Limitations on administrative and nonadministrative ex- penses.....	(48,276,000)	(46,225,700)	(46,280,700)	(-1,995,300)	(+55,000)

Thus, the aggregate additional appropriation under this provision may actually be less than \$1,350,000,000.

Note.—In terms of the February budget aggregates for 1970, the net additional amount is \$1,175,000,000, after taking account of the \$175,000,000 allowance in the February budget total related to a postal pay raise.

¹ And in addition the reserve fund of \$200,000 under this head, fiscal year 1970, may be used for increased pay costs.

² Estimate of cost for the 6 months the 6 percent retroactive pay bill would be in effect during fiscal 1970. Under the bill language, transfers of certain unobligated balances are authorized to help meet the added costs, and some absorptions otherwise are probable.

Calendar No. 918

91ST CONGRESS
2^D SESSION

H. R. 17399

[Report No. 91-917]

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

MAY 11, 1970

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Appropriations

JUNE 8, 1970

Reported, under authority of the order of the Senate of February 7, 1969, by
Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, with amendments

[Omit the part struck through and insert the part printed in italic]

AN ACT

Making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending
June 30, 1970, and for other purposes.

- 1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That the following sums are appropriated out of any money
4 in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to supply supple-
5 mental appropriations (this Act may be cited as the "Second
6 Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1970") for the fiscal year
7 ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes, namely:

1

TITLE I

2

CHAPTER I

3

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

4

EXTENSION SERVICE

5

COOPERATIVE EXTENSION WORK, PAYMENTS, AND

6

EXPENSES

7

8 For an additional amount for "Cooperative extension
9 work, payments and expenses" for "Retirement and em-
10 ployees' compensation costs for extension agents", not to
11 exceed ~~\$597,000~~ \$425,000 to be derived by transfer from
12 the appropriation for "Payments to States and Puerto Rico",
fiscal year 1970.

13

CHAPTER II

14

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—MILITARY

15

RETIRED MILITARY PERSONNEL

16

RETIRED PAY, DEFENSE

17

18 For an additional amount for "Retired pay, Defense,"
\$99,000,000.

19

CHAPTER III

20

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

21

FEDERAL FUNDS

22

FEDERAL PAYMENT TO DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

23

24 For an additional amount for "Federal payment to the
District of Columbia", to be paid to the general fund of the
25 District of Columbia, \$4,042,000.

1 LOANS TO THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FOR CAPITAL

2 OUTLAY

3 For an additional amount for "Loans to the District
4 of Columbia for capital outlay", \$1,293,000, to remain avail-
5 able until expended and to be advanced to the general fund
6 upon request of the Commissioner.

7 DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FUNDS

8 GENERAL OPERATING EXPENSES

9 For an additional amount for "General operating ex-
10 penses", ~~\$2,675~~ \$174,675.

11 PUBLIC SAFETY

12 For an additional amount for "Public safety", including
13 purchase of sixty passenger motor vehicles for police-type
14 use which may exceed the general purchase price limitation
15 for the current fiscal year by not in excess of \$400 per
16 vehicle, ~~\$2,370,500~~ \$3,966,485.

17 The limitation on the expenditure of funds by the Chief
18 of Police for prevention and detection of crime during the cur-
19 rent fiscal year shall be \$100,000.

20 PARKS AND RECREATION

21 For an additional amount for "Parks and recreation",
22 ~~\$47,300~~ \$171,750.

23 SETTLEMENT OF CLAIMS AND SUITS

24 *For payment of property damage claims in excess of*
25 *\$500 and of personal injury claims in excess of \$1,000,*

1 *approved by the Commissioner in accordance with the pro-*
2 *visions of the Act of February 11, 1929, as amended (45*
3 *Stat. 1160; 46 Stat. 500; 65 Stat. 131), \$20,000, payable*
4 *from the general fund.*

5 **CAPITAL OUTLAY**

6 For an additional amount for "Capital outlay", to remain
7 available until expended, ~~\$1,658,000~~ \$8,768,000: *Provided,*
8 *That \$374,500 shall be available for construction services by*
9 *the Director of General Services or by contract for archi-*
10 *tectural engineering services, as may be determined by the*
11 *Commissioner.*

12 **DIVISION OF EXPENSES**

13 The sums appropriated herein for the District of Colum-
14 bia shall be paid out of the general fund of the District of
15 Columbia, except as otherwise specifically provided.

16 **CHAPTER IV**

17 **FOREIGN OPERATIONS**

18 **FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT**

19 *FOREIGN ASSISTANCE*

20 *FOREIGN MILITARY CREDIT SALES*

21 *For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary to*
22 *enable the President to carry out the provisions of the For-*
23 *ign Military Sales Act, as amended, \$250,000,000: Pro-*
24 *vided, That this paragraph shall be effective only upon the*
25 *enactment into law of H.R. 15628, Ninety-first Congress, or*
26 *similar legislation: Provided further, That such funds shall*

1 *remain available until thirty days after the date of approval*
2 *of this Act, or of H.R. 15628, Ninety-first Congress, or*
3 *similar legislation, whichever is later.*

4 INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL INSTITUTION
5 INVESTMENT IN INTER-AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK

6 For an additional amount for subscription to the Inter-
7 American Development Bank, to remain available until ex-
8 pended, \$205,880,000, for the second of two installments
9 of the United States share in the authorized increase in call-
10 able capital stock of the Bank.

11 CHAPTER V

12 INDEPENDENT OFFICES

13 CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

14 FEDERAL LABOR RELATIONS COUNCIL

15 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

16 The limitation heretofore provided on the rate of com-
17 pensation for the public members of the Federal Service Im-
18 passes Panel is increased to a rate of not to exceed the per
19 diem rate equivalent to the rate for grade GS-18.

20 *PAYMENT TO CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT AND*

21 *DISABILITY FUND*

22 *For an additional amount for "Payment to civil service*
23 *retirement and disability fund", as authorized by 5 U.S.C.*
24 *8348, \$157,816,600, to be credited to the civil service re-*
25 *tirement and disability fund.*

1 COMMISSION ON POPULATION GROWTH AND
 2 THE AMERICAN FUTURE
 3 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

4 For expenses necessary for the Commission on Popula-
 5 tion Growth and the American Future, including services as
 6 authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, and hire of passenger motor
 7 vehicles, \$965,000, to remain available until expended.

8 *GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION*
 9 *REAL PROPERTY ACTIVITIES*

10 *SITES AND EXPENSES, PUBLIC BUILDINGS PROJECTS*

11 *For an additional amount for "Sites and expenses, pub-*
 12 *lic buildings projects", \$371,000, to remain available until*
 13 *expended.*

14 SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM
 15 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

16 For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses",
 17 ~~\$7,000,000~~ \$7,433,000.

18 VETERANS ADMINISTRATION
 19 COMPENSATION AND PENSIONS

20 For an additional amount for "Compensation and pen-
 21 sions", \$273,045,000, to remain available until expended.

22 READJUSTMENT BENEFITS

23 For an additional amount for "Readjustment benefits",
 24 \$327,500,000, to remain available until expended.

MEDICAL CARE

For an additional amount for "Medical care", \$113,500,000.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

~~COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY~~

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the Council on Environmental Quality in carrying out its functions under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (Public Law 91-190), including hire of passenger motor vehicles and partial support of the cabinet committee on environmental quality, and the Citizens' Advisory Committee on Environmental Quality, established by Executive Order 11472 of May 29, 1969, or any amendatory order, \$100,000.

COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY AND OFFICE OF

ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the Council on Environmental Quality and the Office of Environmental Quality, in carrying out their functions under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (Public Law 91-190) and the Environmental Quality Improvement Act of 1970 (Public Law 91-224), including hire of passenger vehicles, and

1 *partial support of the Cabinet Committee on the Environment*
2 *and the Citizen's Advisory Committee on Environmental*
3 *Quality, established by Executive Order 11472 of May 29,*
4 *1969, as amended by Executive Order 11514 of March 5,*
5 *1970, \$200,000.*

6 FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

7 DISASTER RELIEF

8 For an additional amount for "Disaster Relief", \$75,-
9 000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That
10 not to exceed 3 per centum of the foregoing amount shall
11 be available for administrative expenses.

12 DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN

13 DEVELOPMENT

14 RENEWAL AND HOUSING ASSISTANCE

15 LOW RENT PUBLIC HOUSING ANNUAL CONTRIBUTIONS

16 For an additional amount for "Low-rent public housing
17 annual contributions", fiscal year 1969, \$13,616,000.

18 COLLEGE HOUSING

19 The limitation on total payments that may be required
20 in any fiscal year by all contracts for annual grants with
21 educational institutions entered into pursuant to Section 401

1 of the Housing Act of 1950, as amended (82 Stat. 604),
2 is increased by \$5,000,000.

3 FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

4 MORTGAGE CREDIT

5 HOMEOWNERSHIP AND RENTAL HOUSING ASSISTANCE

6 The limitation on total payments that may be required
7 in any fiscal year by all contracts entered into under section
8 235 of the National Housing Act, as amended (82 Stat.
9 477), is increased by \$35,000,000, and the limitation on
10 total payments under those entered into under section 236
11 of such Act (82 Stat. 498), is increased by \$35,000,000.

12 CHAPTER VI

13 DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

14 BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

15 MANAGEMENT OF LANDS AND RESOURCES

16 For an additional amount for "Management of lands and
17 resources," \$23,790,000.

18 BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

19 RESOURCES MANAGEMENT

20 For an additional amount for "Resources management,"
21 \$700,000.

1 BUREAU OF OUTDOOR RECREATION

2 LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION

3 For an additional amount for "Land and Water Con-
4 servation," to remain available until expended, \$7,100,000.
5 to be derived from the Land and Water Conservation Fund,
6 and to be available to the National Park Service for property
7 acquisition authorized by the act of September 13, 1962
8 (Public Law 87-657), as amended.

9 OFFICE OF TERRITORIES

10 ADMINISTRATION OF TERRITORIES

11 For an additional amount for "Administration of Ter-
12 ritories," \$275,000, to remain available until expended.

13 GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

14 SURVEYS, INVESTIGATIONS, AND RESEARCH

15 *For an additional amount for "Surveys, investigations,*
16 *and research", \$225,000.*

17 NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

18 MANAGEMENT AND PROTECTION

19 For an additional amount for "Management and Pro-
20 tection," ~~\$850,000~~ \$775,000.

1 RELATED AGENCIES

2 DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

3 FOREST SERVICE

4 FOREST PROTECTION AND UTILIZATION

5 For an additional amount for "Forest protection and
6 utilization," for "Forest land management", ~~\$21,000,000~~
7 *\$21,172,000, including \$172,000 to remain available until*
8 *expended.*

9 NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE
10 HUMANITIES

11 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

12 In addition to amounts heretofore appropriated under
13 this heading there are appropriated amounts equal to the
14 total amount of gifts, bequests, and devises of money, and
15 other property received by each Endowment, during the cur-
16 rent and preceding fiscal years, under the provisions of sec-
17 tion 10 (a) (2) of the National Foundation on the Arts and
18 Humanities Act of 1965, as amended, but not to exceed a
19 total of \$2,000,000, to remain available until expended.

CHAPTER VII

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

MANPOWER ADMINISTRATION

MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING ACTIVITIES

For an additional amount for manpower and development training activities, to carry out the provisions of section 102 of the Manpower Development Training Act of 1962, as amended, \$50,000,000 to remain available until September 30, 1970: Provided, That this appropriation shall not be available for the purposes of sections 106(d) and 309(b) of said Act.

BUREAU OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

AND EX-SERVICEMEN

For an additional amount for "Unemployment compensation for Federal employees and ex-servicemen", \$50,000,000.

TRADE ADJUSTMENT ACTIVITIES

For an additional amount for "Trade Adjustment Activities", \$2,330,000, together with such amount as may be necessary to be charged to the subsequent year appropriation for these expenses for any period subsequent to March 31 of the current year.

1 LIMITATION ON GRANTS TO STATES FOR UNEMPLOYMENT
2 COMPENSATION AND EMPLOYMENT SERVICE ADMINIS-
3 TRATION

4 For an additional amount for "Limitation on grants to
5 States for unemployment compensation and employment
6 service administration", \$10,000,000, to be expended from
7 the employment security administration account in the
8 Unemployment Trust fund.

9 WAGE AND LABOR STANDARDS ADMINISTRATION

10 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

11 For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses",
12 \$37,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$43,000 may be
13 transferred from the amounts herein and heretofore appro-
14 priated for "Salaries and expenses" for the current fiscal year
15 to the fund created by section 44 of the Longshoremen's and
16 Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, as amended.

17 OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

18 FEDERAL CONTRACT COMPLIANCE AND CIVIL RIGHTS

19 PROGRAM

20 For an additional amount for "Federal contract compli-
21 ance and civil rights program, salaries and expenses",
22 \$107,000.

1 DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND
2 WELFARE

3 *HOSPITAL MODERNIZATION AND CONSTRUCTION*

4 *For an additional amount for grants or loans for hos-*
5 *pitals and related facilities pursuant to section 601(b) of*
6 *the Public Health Service Act, \$8,703,078.*

7 *OFFICE OF EDUCATION*

8 *EMERGENCY SCHOOL ASSISTANCE*

9 *For providing emergency assistance to desegregating*
10 *school districts under part D of the Education Professions*
11 *Development Act (title V of the Higher Education Act of*
12 *1965), the Cooperative Research Act, title IV of the Civil*
13 *Rights Act of 1964, section 807 of the Elementary and*
14 *Secondary Education Act of 1965, section 402 of the Ele-*
15 *mentary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1967,*
16 *and title II of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, as*
17 *amended, including necessary administrative expenses there-*
18 *for, \$150,000,000 to remain available until September 30,*
19 *1970: Provided, That no part of any funds appropriated*
20 *herein to carry out programs under title II of the Economic*
21 *Opportunity Act of 1964 shall be included as part of the*
22 *amounts appropriated for the purpose of determining alloca-*
23 *tions for each purpose set forth in clauses (1) through (8)*
24 *of section 102(b) of the Economic Opportunity Amend-*
25 *ments of 1969: Provided further, That funds appropriated*

1 *for administrative expenses shall remain available until*
 2 *June 30, 1971.*

3 SOCIAL AND REHABILITATION SERVICE

4 GRANTS TO STATES FOR PUBLIC ASSISTANCE

5 For an additional amount for "Grants to States for
 6 public assistance," \$146,753,000.

7 SPECIAL INSTITUTIONS

8 HOWARD UNIVERSITY

9 CONSTRUCTION

10 For an additional amount for "Construction", \$7,700,-
 11 000, to remain available until expended.

12 CHAPTER VIII

13 LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

14 SENATE

15 *CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE SENATE*

16 *INQUIRIES AND INVESTIGATIONS*

17 *For an additional amount for "Inquiries and Investi-*
 18 *gations", fiscal year 1970, \$345,000, to be derived by*
 19 *transfer from the appropriation, "Salaries, Officers and*
 20 *Employees", fiscal year 1970.*

21 HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

22 SALARIES, MILEAGE FOR THE MEMBERS, AND EXPENSE

23 ALLOWANCE OF THE SPEAKER

24 COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS

25 For an additional amount for "Compensation of mem-
 26 bers", \$47,000.

1 SALARIES, OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

2 COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

3 For an additional amount for "Committee on Approp-
4 priations", \$35,555.

5 CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE HOUSE

6 MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS

7 For an additional amount for "Miscellaneous items",
8 \$50,000.

9 SPECIAL AND SELECT COMMITTEES

10 For an additional amount for "Special and select com-
11 mittees", \$100,000, to remain available until expended under
12 the provisions of House Resolution 710, Ninety-first
13 Congress.

14 GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

15 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

16 For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses",
17 \$499,000.

18 CHAPTER IX

19 PUBLIC WORKS

20 DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

21 BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

22 COLORADO RIVER BASIN PROJECT

23 For an additional amount for "Colorado River Basin
24 Project", to remain available until expended, \$6,563,000,
25 to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Con-
26 struction and rehabilitation".

CHAPTER X

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND CONFERENCES

CONTRIBUTIONS TO INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

For an additional amount for “Contributions to international organizations”, \$1,600,000.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

LEGAL ACTIVITIES AND GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

FEES AND EXPENSES OF WITNESSES

For an additional amount for “Fees and expenses of witnesses”, \$500,000.

IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for “Salaries and expenses, Immigration and Naturalization Service”, \$892,000.

FEDERAL PRISON SYSTEM

Support of United States Prisoners

For an additional amount for “Support of United States prisoners”, \$850,000.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

NINETEENTH DECENNIAL CENSUS

For an additional amount for the “Nineteenth decennial census”, \$11,000,000, to remain available until December 31, 1972.

1 OFFICE OF FIELD SERVICES

2 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

3 For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses",
4 \$105,000.

5 MARITIME ADMINISTRATION

6 STATE MARINE SCHOOLS

7 *For an additional amount for "State Marine Schools",*
8 *for maintenance and repair of vessels loaned by the United*
9 *States for use in connection with such State marine schools,*
10 \$145,000.

11 THE JUDICIARY

12 CUSTOMS COURT

13 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

14 For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses",
15 \$18,000.

16 COURTS OF APPEALS, DISTRICT COURTS, AND OTHER

17 JUDICIAL SERVICES

18 SALARIES AND EXPENSES, UNITED STATES MAGISTRATES

19 For "Salaries and expenses, United States magistrates",
20 \$550,000.

21 FEES AND EXPENSES OF COURT-APPOINTED COUNSEL

22 For an additional amount for "Fees and expenses of
23 court-appointed counsel", \$1,150,000.

24 For an additional amount for "Fees and expenses of
25 court-appointed counsel", \$300,000, fiscal year 1969.

1 FEES OF JURORS AND COMMISSIONERS

2 For an additional amount for "Fees of jurors and com-
3 missioners", \$500,000.

4 TRAVEL AND MISCELLANEOUS EXPENSES

5 For an additional amount for "Travel and miscellaneous
6 expenses", \$500,000.

7 ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES COURTS

8 For an additional amount for "Administrative Office of
9 the United States Courts", \$15,000.

10 RELATED AGENCIES

11 *DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND*
12 *WELFARE*

13 OFFICE OF EDUCATION

14 CIVIL RIGHTS EDUCATION

15 For an additional amount for "Civil Rights Education",
16 including not to exceed \$250,000 for salaries and expenses,
17 \$5,000,000.

18 CHAPTER XI

19 DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

20 COAST GUARD

21 RETIRED PAY

22 For an additional amount for "Retired pay", ~~\$1,250,-~~
23 ~~000~~ \$1,000,000.

RELATED AGENCY

WASHINGTON METROPOLITAN AREA TRANSIT AUTHORITY

FEDERAL CONTRIBUTION

For an additional amount for "Federal contribution", to enable the Department of Transportation to pay the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority an additional contribution for the rail rapid transit system, as authorized by the National Capital Transportation Act of 1969, (Public Law 91-143), \$82,939,000, to remain available until expended.

CHAPTER XII

TREASURY DEPARTMENT

BUREAU OF ACCOUNTS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for, "Salaries and expenses", \$1,300,000.

BUREAU OF THE PUBLIC DEBT

ADMINISTERING THE PUBLIC DEBT

For an additional amount for "Administering the public debt", ~~\$3,250,000~~ \$3,600,000.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

(Out of Postal Fund)

TRANSPORTATION

For an additional amount for "Transportation", ~~\$10,700,000~~ \$10,600,000.

RELATED AGENCIES

TAX COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses",
~~\$83,000~~ \$67,000.

CHAPTER XIII

CLAIMS AND JUDGMENTS

For payment of claims settled and determined by departments and agencies in accord with law and judgments rendered against the United States by the United States Court of Claims and United States district courts, as set forth in House Document Numbered 91-315, Ninety-first Congress, and Senate Document Numbered 91-86 Ninety-first Congress, ~~\$6,591,406~~, \$23,478,461 together with such amounts as may be necessary to pay interest (as and when specified in such judgments or provided by law) and such additional sums due to increases in rates of exchanges as may be necessary to pay claims in foreign currency: *Provided*, That no judgment herein appropriated for shall be paid until it shall become final and conclusive against the United States by failure of the parties to appeal or otherwise: *Provided further*, That unless otherwise specifically required by law or by judgment, payment of interest wherever appropriated for herein shall not continue for more than thirty days after the date of approval of the Act.

TITLE II

INCREASED PAY COSTS

For additional amounts for appropriations for the fiscal year 1970, for increased pay costs authorized by or pursuant to law, as follows:

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

SENATE

"Compensation of the Vice President and Senators",
\$10,835;

"Salaries, officers and employees", \$3,634,674;

"Office of the Legislative Counsel of the Senate",
\$39,120;

Contingent expenses of the Senate:

"Senate policy committees", \$47,120;

"Automobiles and maintenance", \$4,140;

"Inquiries and investigations", \$662,515; including \$23,695 for the Committee on Appropriations;

"Folding documents", \$4,660;

"Miscellaneous items", \$92,810;

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

"Office of the Parliamentarian", \$10,865;

"Compilation of precedents of House of Representatives", \$1,330;

"Office of the Chaplain", \$1,805;

1 "Office of the Clerk", \$100,000;

2 "Office of the Sergeant at Arms", \$250,000;

3 "Office of the Doorkeeper", \$120,000;

4 "Office of the Postmaster", \$62,900;

5 "Committee employees", \$700,000;

6 Special and minority employees:

7 "House Democratic steering committee", \$1,310;

8 "House Republican conference", \$1,310;

9 "Majority leader", \$8,135;

10 "Minority leader", \$7,265;

11 "Majority whip", \$5,525;

12 "Minority whip", \$5,525;

13 "Official reporters of debates", \$32,605;

14 "Official reporters to committees", \$32,370;

15 "Committee on Appropriations", \$89,445;

16 "Office of the legislative counsel", \$23,400;

17 "Members' clerk hire", \$850,000;

18 Contingent expenses of the House:

19 "Government contributions", \$760,000, and in
20 addition such amount as may be necessary may be
21 transferred from the appropriation for "miscellane-
22 ous items";

23 "Speaker's automobile", \$1,500;

1 "Majority leader's automobile", \$1,500;

2 "Minority leader's automobile", \$1,500;

3 Joint items:

4 Contingent expenses of the Senate:

5 "Joint Economic Committee", ~~\$44,490~~ \$43,-
6 475;

7 "Joint Committee on Atomic Energy",
8 \$32,460;

9 "Joint Committee on Printing", \$15,175;

10 Contingent expenses of the House:

11 "Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Tax-
12 ation", \$10,065;

13 "Joint Committee on Defense Production",
14 \$10,850;

15 ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

16 Office of the Architect of the Capitol: "Salaries",
17 \$56,000.

18 Capitol buildings and grounds:

19 "Capitol buildings", \$55,500;

20 "Capitol grounds", \$28,200;

21 "*Senate office buildings*", \$146,300

22 "*Senate garage*", \$3,400;

1 “House office buildings”, \$120,000;

2 “Capitol power plant”, \$20,800;

3 Library buildings and grounds: “Structural and me-
4 chanical care”, \$10,000.

5 BOTANIC GARDEN

6 “Salaries and expenses”, \$24,000;

7 LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

8 “Salaries and expenses”, \$1,313,500;

9 Copyright Office: “Salaries and expenses”, \$274,000

10 Legislative Reference Service: “Salaries and expenses”,
11 \$414,000;

12 Distribution of catalog cards: “Salaries and expenses”,
13 \$159,000, and in addition the reserve fund of \$200,000
14 under this head, fiscal year 1970, may be used for increased
15 pay costs;

16 Books for the blind and physically handicapped: “Sal-
17 aries and expenses”, \$33,000;

18 Organizing and microfilming the papers of the Presi-
19 dents: “Salaries and expenses”, \$13,200;

20 “Collection and distribution of library materials (special
21 foreign currency program)”, \$14,000;

1 GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

2 Office of Superintendent of Documents: "Salaries and
3 expenses", \$395,400, and in addition the reserve fund of
4 \$200,000 under this head, fiscal year 1970, may be used
5 for pay costs;

6 GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

7 "Salaries and expenses", \$5,142,000;

8 THE JUDICIARY

9 SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

10 "Salaries", \$194,000;

11 "Care of the building and grounds", \$21,700;

12 COURT OF CUSTOMS AND PATENT APPEALS

13 "Salaries and expenses", \$22,000;

14 CUSTOMS COURT

15 "Salaries and expenses", \$128,500;

16 COURTS OF APPEALS, DISTRICT COURTS, AND OTHER

17 JUDICIAL SERVICES

18 "Salaries of supporting personnel", \$4,370,000;

19 "Administrative Office of the United States Courts",
20 \$190,000, of which \$20,000 shall be derived by transfer
21 from the appropriation for "Expenses of referees";

22 "Expenses of referees", \$608,000;

23 EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

24 The White House Office: "Salaries and expenses",
25 \$310,000;

26 "Operating expenses, Executive Mansion", \$48,000;

1 BUREAU OF THE BUDGET

2 "Salaries and expenses", \$491,000;

3 COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS

4 "Salaries and expenses", \$50,000;

5 NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE COUNCIL

6 "Salaries and expenses", \$49,000;

7 OFFICE OF EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS

8 "Salaries and expenses", \$290,000;

9 SPECIAL REPRESENTATIVE FOR TRADE NEGOTIATIONS

10 "Salaries and expenses", \$51,000;

11 FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

12 PEACE CORPS

13 "Salaries and expenses": (Increase of \$1,651,000 in
14 the limitation on administrative expenses) ;

15 FOREIGN ASSISTANCE: ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE

16 "Administrative expenses", \$3,200,000, to be derived
17 by transfer from appropriations for "Economic assistance",
18 fiscal year 1970;

19 "Administrative and other expenses": \$200,000, to be
20 derived by transfer from appropriations for "Economic as-
21 sistance", fiscal year 1970;

22 DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

23 AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH SERVICE

24 "Salaries and expenses", for "Research", \$8,381,000,
25 and for "Plant and animal disease and pest control".
26 \$5,119,000;

COOPERATIVE STATE RESEARCH SERVICE

“Payments and expenses”, \$130,000;

EXTENSION SERVICE

“Cooperative extension work, payments and expenses”,
for “Federal Extension Service”, \$250,000;

FARMER COOPERATIVE SERVICE

“Salaries and expenses”, \$131,000;

SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

“Conservation operations”, \$9,450,000;

“River basin surveys and investigations”, \$652,000, to
remain available until expended;

“Watershed planning”, \$491,000, to remain available
until expended;

“Watershed works of improvement”, \$2,159,000, to re-
main available until expended;

“Flood prevention”, \$815,000, to remain available
until expended;

“Great plains conservation program”, \$342,000, to re-
main available until expended;

“Resource conservation and development”, \$573,000,
to remain available until expended;

ECONOMIC RESEARCH SERVICE

“Salaries and expenses”, \$1,142,000;

STATISTICAL REPORTING SERVICE

“Salaries and expenses”, \$1,116,000;

CONSUMER AND MARKETING SERVICE

“Consumer protective, marketing, and regulatory programs”, \$5,250,000;

FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL SERVICE

“Salaries and expenses”, \$600,000;

COMMODITY EXCHANGE AUTHORITY

“Salaries and expenses”, \$170,000;

AGRICULTURAL STABILIZATION AND CONSERVATION
SERVICE

“Expenses, Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service”, \$7,899,000, of which \$600,000 shall be derived by transfer from the appropriation for “Conservation reserve program”, fiscal year 1970, and \$1,299,000 from the Commodity Credit Corporation Fund;

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

“Salaries and expenses”, \$1,022,000;

PACKERS AND STOCKYARDS ADMINISTRATION

“Salaries and expenses”, \$154,000;

OFFICE OF THE GENERAL COUNSEL

“Salaries and expenses”, \$427,000;

OFFICE OF INFORMATION

“Salaries and expenses”, \$150,000;

NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL LIBRARY

“Salaries and expenses”, \$175,000;

1 OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT SERVICES

2 "Salaries and expenses", \$237,000;

3 GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

4 "Salaries and expenses", \$425,000;

5 RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

6 "Salaries and expenses", \$1,075,000;

7 FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION

8 "Salaries and expenses", \$5,200,000;

9 FOREST SERVICE

10 "Forest protection and utilization", \$10,266,000;

11 FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE CORPORATION

12 "Administrative and operating expenses", \$691,000,

13 which may be paid from premium income;

14 DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

15 GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

16 "Salaries and expenses", \$604,000;

17 OFFICE OF BUSINESS ECONOMICS

18 "Salaries and expenses," \$238,000;

19 BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

20 "Salaries and expenses", \$1,141,000;

21 "Nineteenth decennial census", \$6,722,000, to remain
22 available until December 31, 1972;

23 "1967 economic censuses", \$282,000, to remain avail-
24 able until December 31, 1970;

1 ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION

2 “Operations and administration”, \$1,121,000;

3 BUSINESS AND DEFENSE SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

4 “Salaries and expenses”, \$505,000;

5 INTERNATIONAL ACTIVITIES

6 “Salaries and expenses”, \$835,000;

7 “Export control”, \$446,000;

8 OFFICE OF FIELD SERVICES

9 “Salaries and expenses”, \$389,000;

10 MINORITY BUSINESS ENTERPRISE

11 “Salaries and expenses”, \$94,000;

12 FOREIGN DIRECT INVESTMENT CONTROL

13 “Salaries and expenses”, \$100,000;

14 ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCE SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

15 “Salaries and expenses”, \$8,040,000;

16 “Research and development”, \$1,239,000, to remain
17 available until expended;

18 “Satellite operations”, \$421,000, to remain available un-
19 til expended;

20 PATENT OFFICE

21 “Salaries and expenses”, \$3,135,000;

22 NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS

23 “Research and technical services”, \$2,187,000;

1 MARITIME ADMINISTRATION

2 "Salaries and expenses", for administrative expenses,
3 \$746,000;

4 "Maritime training", \$204,000;

5 DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—MILITARY

6 MILITARY PERSONNEL

7 "Military personnel, Army", \$538,000,000;

8 "Military personnel, Navy", \$360,000,000;

9 "Military personnel, Marine Corps", \$123,300,000;

10 "Military personnel, Air Force", ~~\$485,000,000~~ \$502,-
11 500,000;

12 "Reserve personnel, Army", \$22,900,000;

13 "Reserve personnel, Navy", \$6,000,000;

14 "Reserve personnel, Marine Corps", \$4,000,000;

15 "National Guard personnel, Army", \$33,500,000;

16 "National Guard personnel, Air Force", \$10,000,000;

17 RETIRED MILITARY PERSONNEL

18 "Retired pay, Defense", \$25,000,000;

19 OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

20 "Operation and maintenance, Army", ~~\$196,480,000~~
21 \$206,900,000;

22 "Operation and maintenance, Navy", ~~\$157,800,000~~
23 \$166,100,000;

24 "Operation and maintenance, Marine Corps", \$7,000,-
25 000;

26 "Operation and maintenance, Air Force", \$84,200,000;

1 “Operation and maintenance, Defense agencies”, \$70,-
 2 ~~400,000~~ \$74,200,000;

3 “Operation and maintenance, Army National Guard”,
 4 ~~\$13,800,000~~ \$14,800,000;

5 “Operation and maintenance, Air National Guard”,
 6 \$12,250,000;

7 “Court of Military Appeals”, \$70,000;

8 CIVIL DEFENSE

9 “Operation and maintenance”, \$850,000;

10 DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

11 DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

12 CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

13 “Operation and maintenance, general”, \$6,905,000;

14 “General expenses”, \$2,000,000;

15 RYUKYU ISLANDS, ARMY

16 “Administration”, \$200,000;

17 U.S. SOLDIERS’ HOME

18 “Operation and maintenance”, \$296,000;

19 THE PANAMA CANAL

20 CANAL ZONE GOVERNMENT

21 “Operating expenses”, \$963,000;

22 PANAMA CANAL COMPANY

23 “Limitation on general and administrative expenses”,
 24 (Increase of \$605,000 in the limitation on general and ad-
 25 ministrative expenses) ;

1 DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND
2 WELFARE
3 CONSUMER PROTECTION AND ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH
4 SERVICE

5 "Food and drug control", \$2,294,000, to be derived by
6 transfer from the appropriation for "Health services research
7 and development", fiscal year 1970;

8 "Air pollution control", \$1,062,000, to be derived by
9 transfer from the appropriation for "Comprehensive health
10 planning and services", fiscal year 1970;

11 "Environmental control", \$757,000, to be derived by
12 transfer from the appropriation for "Regional medical pro-
13 grams", fiscal year 1970;

14 "Office of the Administrator, salaries and expenses",
15 \$354,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation
16 for "National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases",
17 fiscal year 1970;

18 HEALTH SERVICES AND MENTAL HEALTH
19 ADMINISTRATION

20 "Mental health", \$358,000, to be derived by transfer
21 from the appropriation for "National Institute of Allergy and
22 Infectious Diseases", fiscal year 1970;

23 "Saint Elizabeths Hospital", \$2,519,000, to be derived

1 by transfer from the appropriation for “National Institute of
2 Neurological Diseases and Stroke”, fiscal year 1970;

3 “Communicable diseases”, \$2,446,000, to be derived by
4 transfer from the appropriation for “Maternal and child
5 health and welfare”, fiscal year 1970;

6 “Hospital construction”, \$208,000, to be derived by
7 transfer from the appropriation for “National Institute of
8 Arthritis and Metabolic Diseases”, fiscal year 1970;

9 “Patient care and special health services”, \$5,241,000,
10 to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for “National
11 Institute of Arthritis and Metabolic Diseases”, fiscal year
12 1970;

13 “National health statistics”, \$329,000, to be derived by
14 transfer from the appropriation for “National Institute of
15 Arthritis and Metabolic Diseases”, fiscal year 1970;

16 “Indian health services”, \$4,464,000, to be derived by
17 transfer from the appropriation for “National Institute of
18 General Medical Sciences”, fiscal year 1970;

19 “Office of the Administrator, salaries and expenses”,
20 \$691,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation
21 for “National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Stroke”,
22 fiscal year 1970;

1 NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

2 "Office of the Director, Salaries and expenses", \$218,-
3 000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for
4 "National Institute of General Medical Sciences", fiscal year
5 1970;

6 OFFICE OF EDUCATION

7 "School assistance in federally affected areas", \$14,000,
8 to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Re-
9 search and training, Office of Education", fiscal year 1970;
10 "Libraries and community services", \$300,000, to be
11 derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Research
12 and training, Office of Education", fiscal year 1970;
13 "Salaries and expenses", \$2,528,000, to be derived by
14 transfer from the appropriation for "Research and training,
15 Office of Education", fiscal year 1970;

16 SOCIAL AND REHABILITATION SERVICE

17 "Salaries and expenses", \$2,496,000, to be derived by
18 transfer from the appropriation for "National Institute of
19 Allergy and Infectious Diseases", fiscal year 1970;
20 "Assistance to refugees in the United States", \$90,000,
21 to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Na-
22 tional Institute of Neurological Diseases and Stroke", fiscal
23 year 1970;

1 SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

2 “Limitation on salaries and expenses (trust fund)” (In-
3 crease of \$21,276,000 in the limitation on “Salaries and ex-
4 penses”);

5 SPECIAL INSTITUTIONS

6 “Model Secondary School for the Deaf, salaries and ex-
7 penses”, \$12,000, to be derived by transfer from the appro-
8 priation for “National Institute of Neurological Diseases and
9 Stroke”, fiscal year 1970;

10 “Gallaudet College, salaries and expenses”, \$162,000,
11 to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for “Na-
12 tional Institute of Neurological Diseases and Stroke”, fiscal
13 year 1970;

14 “Howard University, salaries and expenses”, \$664,000,
15 to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for “Com-
16 prehensive health planning and services”, fiscal year 1970;

17 “Freedmen’s Hospital”, \$766,000, to be derived by
18 transfer from the appropriation for “comprehensive health
19 planning and services”, fiscal year 1970;

20 DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT

21 “Office of the Secretary, salaries and expenses”,
22 \$451,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation

1 for "Comprehensive health planning and services", fiscal
2 year 1970;

3 "Office for Civil Rights, salaries and expenses", \$496,-
4 000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for
5 "Comprehensive health planning and services", fiscal year
6 1970;

7 "Office of Community and Field Services, salaries and
8 expenses", \$607,000, to be derived by transfer from the
9 appropriation for "Comprehensive health planning and serv-
10 ices", fiscal year 1970;

11 "Office of the Comptroller, salaries and expenses",
12 \$1,018,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropria-
13 tion for "Comprehensive health planning and services", fiscal
14 year 1970;

15 "Office of the Administrator, salaries and expenses",
16 \$476,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation
17 for "Comprehensive health planning and services", fiscal
18 year 1970;

19 "Surplus property utilization", \$107,000, to be derived
20 by transfer from the appropriation for "Comprehensive
21 health planning and services", fiscal year 1970;

22 "Office of the General Counsel, salaries and expenses",
23 \$337,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation
24 for "Comprehensive health planning and services", fiscal
25 year 1970;

1 DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN
2 DEVELOPMENT

3 RENEWAL AND HOUSING ASSISTANCE

4 "Salaries and expenses", \$2,508,000;

5 METROPOLITAN DEVELOPMENT

6 "Salaries and expenses", \$480,700;

7 MODEL CITIES AND GOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

8 "Salaries and expenses", \$27,600, together with not to
9 exceed \$400,900, to be derived by transfer from the appro-
10 priation for "Model cities programs" fiscal year 1970;

11 FEDERAL INSURANCE ADMINISTRATION

12 "Flood insurance", \$28,500;

13 FAIR HOUSING AND EQUAL OPPORTUNITY

14 "Fair housing and equal opportunity", \$391,400.

15 DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT

16 "General administration", \$559,500;

17 "Regional management and services", \$655,000;

18 "Limitation on administrative expenses, college housing
19 loans" (Increase of \$75,000 in the limitation on administra-
20 tive expenses) ;

21 "Limitation on administrative expenses, public facility
22 loans" (Increase of \$55,000 in the limitation on adminis-
23 trative expenses) ;

24 "Limitation on administrative expenses, revolving fund

1 (liquidating programs)'' (Increase of \$6,700 in the limita-
 2 tion on administrative expenses) ;

3 "Limitation on administrative and nonadministrative ex-
 4 penses, Federal housing administration" (Increase of \$450,-
 5 000 in the limitation on administrative expenses and increase
 6 of \$5,175,000 in the limitation on nonadministrative ex-
 7 penses) ;

8 DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

9 BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

10 "Management of lands and resources", \$3,498,000;

11 BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

12 "Education and welfare services", \$9,799,000;

13 "Resources management", \$4,378,000;

14 "General administrative expenses", \$500,000;

15 BUREAU OF OUTDOOR RECREATION

16 "Salaries and expenses", \$200,000;

17 GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

18 "Surveys, investigations, and research", \$3,310,000;

19 BUREAU OF MINES

20 "Conservation and development of mineral resources",
 21 \$3,164,000;

22 "Health and safety", \$1,120,000;

23 "General administrative expenses", \$152,000;

24 OFFICE OF OIL AND GAS

25 "Salaries and expenses", \$91,000;

1 BUREAU OF COMMERCIAL FISHERIES

2 “Management and investigations of resources”, \$936,-
3 000;

4 “Federal aid for commercial fisheries research and de-
5 velopment”, \$13,000;

6 “Anadromous and Great Lakes fisheries conservation”,
7 \$11,000;

8 “General administrative expenses”, \$131,000;

9 “Administration of Pribilof Islands”, \$120,000, to be
10 derived from the Pribilof Islands fund;

11 “Limitation on administrative expenses, fisheries loan
12 fund” (Increase of \$25,000 in the limitation on administra-
13 tive expenses) ;

14 BUREAU OF SPORT FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE

15 “Management and investigations of resources”, \$3,363.-
16 000;

17 “General administrative expenses”, \$176,000;

18 “Anadromous and Great Lakes fisheries conservation”,
19 \$17,000;

20 NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

21 “Management and protection”, \$3,359,000;

22 “Maintenance and rehabilitation of physical facilities”,
23 \$1,346,000;

24 “General administrative expenses”, \$263,000;

25 “Preservation of historic properties”, \$40,000;

1 BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

2 “General investigations”, \$900,000;

3 “Operation and maintenance”, \$1,870,000;

4 “General administrative expenses”, \$970,000;

5 BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION

6 “Operation and maintenance”, \$800,000;

7 SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

8 “Operation and maintenance”, \$155,000;

9 OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR

10 “Salaries and expenses”, \$374,000;

11 OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

12 “Salaries and expenses”, \$702,000;

13 OFFICE OF WATER RESOURCES RESEARCH

14 “Salaries and expenses”, \$52,000;

15 DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

16 LEGAL ACTIVITIES AND GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

17 “Salaries and expenses, general administration”, \$634,-
18 000;

19 “Salaries and expenses, general legal activities”, \$2,-
20 264,000;

21 “Salaries and expenses, Antitrust Division”, \$769,000;

22 “Salaries and expenses, United States attorneys and
23 marshals”, \$3,824,000;

24 “Salaries and expenses, Community Relations Service”,
5 \$230,000;

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

“Salaries and expenses”, \$17,455,000;

IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE

“Salaries and expenses”, \$7,452,000;

FEDERAL PRISON SYSTEM

“Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Prisons”, \$5,109,000;

FEDERAL PRISON INDUSTRIES, INCORPORATED

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE AND VOCATIONAL

TRAINING EXPENSES, FEDERAL PRISON INDUSTRIES,

INCORPORATED

In addition to the amount hertofore made available under this heading for administrative expenses, \$55,000 shall be available for such expenses during the current fiscal year.

BUREAU OF NARCOTICS AND DANGEROUS DRUGS

“Salaries and expenses”, \$1,530,000;

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

MANPOWER ADMINISTRATION

“Manpower development and training activities”, \$145,000, of which \$100,000 shall be derived by transfer from the appropriation for “Office of Manpower Administrator, salaries and expenses”, fiscal year 1970;

“Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training, salaries and expenses”, \$343,000;

“Bureau of Employment Security, salaries ~~and~~ ex-

1 penses", \$1,408,000, to be expended from the Employ-
2 ment Security Administration account in the Unemploy-
3 ment Trust Fund;

4 LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS

5 "Labor-Management Services Administration, salaries
6 and expenses", \$805,000;

7 WAGE AND LABOR STANDARDS

8 "Wage and Labor Standards Administration, salaries
9 and expenses", \$713,000;

10 "Wage and Hour Division, salaries and expenses",
11 \$1,440,000;

12 BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS

13 "Salaries and expenses", \$1,693,000;

14 BUREAU OF INTERNATIONAL LABOR AFFAIRS

15 "Salaries and expenses", \$130,000;

16 OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR

17 "Salaries and expenses", \$438,000; and, in addition,
18 \$13,000 to be derived from the Employment Security Ad-
19 ministration account, Unemployment Trust Fund;

20 OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

21 "Salaries and expenses", \$515,000; and, in addition,

1 \$36,000 to be derived from the Employment Security Ad-
2 ministration account, Unemployment Trust Fund;

3 OFFICE OF FEDERAL CONTRACT COMPLIANCE AND
4 CIVIL RIGHTS PROGRAM

5 "Salaries and expenses", \$56,000; and, in addition,
6 \$53,000 to be derived from the Employment Security Ad-
7 ministration account, Unemployment Trust Fund;

8 POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT
9 (OUT OF THE POSTAL FUND)

10 "Administration and regional operation"; \$10,715,000;

11 "Research, development, and engineering", \$898,000;
12 to remain available until expended;

13 "Operations", \$261,956,000;

14 "Supplies and services", \$215,000;

15 DEPARTMENT OF STATE

16 ADMINISTRATION OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS

17 "Salaries and expenses," \$13,400,000;

18 "Acquisition, operation, and maintenance of buildings
19 abroad," \$177,000, to remain available until expended;

20 INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND CONFERENCES

21 "Missions to international organizations," \$340,000;

1 INTERNATIONAL COMMISSIONS

2 INTERNATIONAL BOUNDARY AND WATER COMMISSION;

3 UNITED STATES AND MEXICO

4 *International Boundary and Water Commission, United*
 5 *States and Mexico:*

6 “Salaries and expenses,” \$81,000;

7 *“Salaries and expenses,” \$81,000;*

8 “Operation and maintenance,” \$175,000;

9 *“Operation and maintenance,” \$175,000;*

10 “American sections, international commissions,” \$42,-
 11 000;

12 “International fisheries commissions,” \$56,000;

13 EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE

14 “Mutual educational and cultural exchange activities,”
 15 \$700,000;

16 OTHER

17 “Migration and refugee assistance,” \$60,000;

18 DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

19 OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

20 “Salaries and expenses”, \$720,000;

21 COAST GUARD

22 “Operating expenses”, \$21,675,000;

23 “Reserve training”, \$1,000,000;

24 FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION

25 “Operations”, \$58,597,000;

1 “Operation and maintenance, National Capital airports”,
2 \$400,000;

3 FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION

4 “Office of the Administrator, salaries and expenses”,
5 \$132,000 (together with an increase of \$941,000 in the
6 amount to be transferred from the appropriation for “Fed-
7 eral-aid Highways trust fund”) ;

8 “Traffic and highway safety”, \$600,000;

9 “Motor carrier safety”, \$173,000;

10 “Bureau of Public Roads, limitation on general ex-
11 penses” (Increase of \$3,081,000 in the limitation on ad-
12 ministrative expenses to be paid from the appropriation for
13 the “Federal-aid highways trust fund”) ;

14 FEDERAL RAILROAD ADMINISTRATION

15 “Office of the Administrator, salaries and expenses”,
16 \$85,000;

17 “Bureau of Railroad Safety”, \$270,000;

18 URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ADMINISTRATION

19 “Salaries and expenses”, \$100,000;

20 SAINT LAWRENCE SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

21 “Limitation on administrative expenses” (Increase of
22 \$52,000 in the limitation on administrative expenses) ;

23 NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD

24 “Salaries and expenses”, \$350,000;

1 TREASURY DEPARTMENT

2 OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

3 "Salaries and expenses", \$628,000;

4 BUREAU OF ACCOUNTS

5 "Salaries and expenses", \$400,000;

6 BUREAU OF CUSTOMS

7 "Salaries and expenses", \$8,830,000;

8 BUREAU OF THE MINT

9 "Salaries and expenses", \$500,000;

10 BUREAU OF THE PUBLIC DEBT

11 "Administering the public debt", \$1,444,000;

12 INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE

13 "Salaries and expenses", \$1,846,000;

14 "Revenue accounting and processing", \$11,920,000;

15 "Compliance", \$46,291,000;

16 OFFICE OF THE TREASURER

17 "Salaries and expenses", \$523,000;

18 UNITED STATES SECRET SERVICE

19 "Salaries and expenses", ~~\$1,740,000~~ \$1,940,000: *Pro-*
 20 *vided, That \$200,000 of this appropriation shall be available*
 21 *only upon enactment into law of S. 2694, Ninety-first Con-*
 22 *gress, or similar legislation;*

23 ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

24 "Operating expenses", \$5,000,000;

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

“Operating expenses, Public Buildings Service”,
\$7,222,000;

“Operating expenses, Federal Supply Service”,
\$4,431,000;

“Operating expenses, National Archives and Records
Service”, \$1,635,000;

“Operating expenses, Transportation and Communica-
tions Service”, \$528,000;

“Operating expenses, Property Management and Dis-
posal Service”, \$796,000;

“Salaries and expenses, Office of Administrator”,
\$71,000;

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE

ADMINISTRATION

“Research and program management”, \$38,000,000;

VETERANS ADMINISTRATION

“Medical and prosthetic research”, \$2,983,000;

“Medical administration and miscellaneous operating
expenses”, \$955,000;

“General operating expenses”, \$15,835,000;

OTHER INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

AMERICAN BATTLE MONUMENTS COMMISSION

“Salaries and expenses”, \$77,000;

1 CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

2 "Salaries and expenses", \$900,000;

3 CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

4 "Salaries and expenses", \$2,354,000;

5 EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION

6 "Salaries and expenses", \$900,000;

7 EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF THE UNITED STATES

8 "Limitation on administrative expenses" (Increase of
9 \$400,000 in the limitation on administrative expenses) ;

10 FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

11 "Limitation on administrative expenses" (Increase of
12 \$215,000 in the limitation on administrative expenses) ;

13 FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

14 "Salaries and expenses", \$1,700,000;

15 FEDERAL FIELD COMMITTEE FOR DEVELOPMENT

16 PLANNING IN ALASKA

17 "Salaries and expenses", \$21,000;

18 FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

19 "Limitation on administrative and nonadministrative ex-
20 penses, Federal Home Loan Bank Board" (Increase of
21 \$412,000 in the limitation on administrative expenses, and
22 increase of \$325,000 in the limitation on nonadministrative
23 expenses) ;

24 "Limitation on administrative expenses, Federal Savings
25 and Loan Insurance Corporation" (Increase of \$24,000 in
26 the limitation on administrative expenses) ;

FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION

“Salaries and expenses”, \$228,000;

FEDERAL MEDIATION AND CONCILIATION SERVICE

“Salaries and expenses”, \$615,000;

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

“Salaries and expenses”, \$1,300,000;

FEDERAL RADIATION COUNCIL

“Salaries and expenses”, \$8,000;

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

“Salaries and expenses”, \$1,000,000;

FOREIGN CLAIMS SETTLEMENT COMMISSION

“Salaries and expenses”, \$56,000;

HISTORICAL AND MEMORIAL COMMISSIONS

American Revolution Bicentennial Commission:

“Salaries and expenses”, \$10,000;

INTER-AGENCY COMMITTEE ON MEXICAN-AMERICAN

AFFAIRS

“Salaries and expenses”, \$27,000;

INTERGOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES

ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL

RELATIONS

“Salaries and expenses”, \$45,000;

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION

“Salaries and expenses”, \$42,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for “Appalachian regional development programs”;

1 INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

2 "Salaries and expenses", \$1,900,000;

3 NATIONAL CAPITAL PLANNING COMMISSION

4 "Salaries and expenses", \$25,000;

5 NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE

6 HUMANITIES

7 "Salaries and expenses", \$120,000;

8 NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

9 "Salaries and expenses", \$1,642,000;

10 NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

11 "Salaries and expenses", \$127,000;

12 PRESIDENT'S COMMITTEE ON CONSUMER INTERESTS

13 "Salaries and expenses", \$10,000;

14 RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

15 "Limitation on salaries and expenses" (Increase of
16 \$990,000 in the limitation on "Salaries and expenses") ;

17 RENEGOTIATION BOARD

18 "Salaries and expenses", \$110,000;

19 SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

20 "Salaries and expenses", \$1,000,000;

21 SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

22 "Salaries and expenses", \$3,971,000, of which \$3,163,-
23 000 shall be derived by transfer from the "Business loan and

investment fund", from the "Disaster loan fund", and from
the "Lease guarantees revolving fund";

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

"Salaries and expenses", \$1,331,000;

"Salaries and expenses, National Gallery of Art,"
\$191,000;

SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL BOARD

Salaries and expenses", \$57,000;

TARIFF COMMISSION

"Salaries and expenses", \$239,000;

TAX COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

"Salaries and expenses", \$140,000;

UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY

"Salaries and expenses", \$6,883,000;

"Special international exhibitions", \$183,000 to remain
available until expended;

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

(OUT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FUNDS)

"General operating expenses", ~~\$1,932,000~~ \$2,229,000;

"Public safety", ~~\$1,780,000~~ \$2,324,000;

"Education", \$966,000;

"Parks and recreation", ~~\$652,000~~ \$899,000;

"Health and welfare," ~~\$4,478,000~~ \$4,624,000;

1 “Highways and traffic”, \$600,000;

2 “Sanitary engineering”, ~~\$1,096,000~~ \$1,905,000.

3 DIVISION OF EXPENSES

4 The sums appropriated in this title for the District of
 5 Columbia shall be paid as follows: ~~\$10,332,000~~ \$12,191,000
 6 from the general fund; ~~\$533,000~~ \$535,000 from the high-
 7 way fund (regular); \$14,000 from the highway fund (park-
 8 ing); ~~\$375,000~~ \$468,000 from the water fund; and
 9 ~~\$250,000~~ \$339,000 from the sanitary sewage works fund.

10 TITLE III

11 INCREASED PAY COSTS—FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

12 SALARY ACT OF 1970

13 SEC. 301. For costs in the fiscal year 1970 of pay in-
 14 creases granted by or pursuant to the Federal Employees
 15 Salary Act of 1970 and the Act of December 16, 1967 (81
 16 Stat. 649), for any branch of the Federal Government or
 17 the municipal government of the District of Columbia, to be
 18 available immediately, such amounts as may be necessary,
 19 to be determined as hereinafter provided in this title, but
 20 no appropriation, fund, limitation, or authorization may be
 21 increased pursuant to the provisions of this title in an amount
 22 in excess of the cost to such appropriation, fund, limitation,
 23 or authorization of increased compensation pursuant to such
 24 statutes.

25 SEC. 302. Any officer having administrative control of

an appropriation, fund, limitation, or authorization properly chargeable with the costs in the fiscal year 1970 of pay increases granted by or pursuant to the Federal Employees Salary Act of 1970 and the Act of December 16, 1967 (81 Stat. 649), is authorized to transfer thereto, from the unobligated balance of any other appropriation, fund, or authorization under his administrative control and expiring for obligation on June 30, 1970, such amounts as may be necessary for meeting such costs.

SEC. 303. Whenever any officer referred to in section 304 of this title shall determine that he has exhausted the possibilities of meeting the cost of pay increases through the use of transfers as authorized by said section, he shall certify the additional amount required to meet such costs for each appropriation, fund, limitation, or authorization under his administrative control, and the amounts so certified shall be added to the pertinent appropriation, fund, limitation, or authorization for the fiscal year 1970: *Provided*, That any transfer under the authority of section 302 or any certification made under the authority of this section by an officer in or under the executive branch of the Federal Government shall be valid only when approved by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

SEC. 304. For the purposes of the transfers and certifications authorized by sections 302 and 303 of this title, the

1 following officers shall be deemed to have administrative con-
2 trol of appropriations, funds, limitations, or authorizations
3 available within their respective organization units—

4 (a) For the legislative branch:

5 The Clerk of the House;

6 The Secretary of the Senate;

7 The Librarian of Congress;

8 The Architect of the Capitol;

9 The Public Printer;

10 The Comptroller General of the United States;

11 The Chief Judge of the United States Tax Court;

12 The chairman of any commission in or under the
13 legislative branch.

14 (b) For the Judiciary:

15 The Administrative Officer of the United States
16 Courts.

17 (c) For the executive branch:

18 The head of each department, agency, or cor-
19 poration in or under the executive branch.

20 (d) For the municipal government of the District of
21 Columbia:

22 The Commissioner of the District of Columbia.

23 SEC. 305. Obligations or expenditures incurred for costs
24 in the fiscal year 1970 of pay increases granted by or pur-
25 suant to the Federal Employees Salary Act of 1970 and the
26 Act of December 16, 1967 (81 Stat. 649), shall not be

1 regarded or reported as violations of section 3679 of the
2 Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665).

3 SEC. 306. (a) Amounts made available by this title
4 shall be derived from the same source as the appropriation,
5 fund, limitation, or authorization to which such amounts
6 are added.

7 (b) Appropriations made by, and transfers made pur-
8 suant to, this title shall be recorded on the books of the
9 Government as of June 30, 1970: *Provided*, That no ap-
10 propriation made by this title shall be warranted, and no
11 transfer authorized by this title shall be made, after Au-
12 gust 15, 1970.

13 (c) A complete report of the appropriations and trans-
14 fers made by or pursuant to this title shall be made, not later
15 than September 15, 1970, by the officers described in section
16 304, to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, who shall
17 compile and transmit to the Congress a consolidated report
18 not later than October 15, 1970.

19 TITLE IV

20 LIMITATION ON FISCAL YEAR 1970 BUDGET

21 OUTLAYS

22 SEC. 401. (a) Notwithstanding the provisions of title
23 IV of the Second Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1969,
24 expenditures and net lending (budget outlays) of the Fed-
25 eral Government during the fiscal year ending June 30,

1 1970, shall not exceed \$197,885,000,000: *Provided*, That
2 whenever action, or inaction, by the Congress on requests for
3 appropriations and other budgetary proposals varies from
4 the President's recommendations with respect to the fiscal
5 year 1970, as reflected in the Budget for 1971 (H. Doc.
6 91-240, part 1), the Director of the Bureau of the Budget
7 shall report to the President and to the Congress his estimate
8 of the effect of such action or inaction on budget outlays, and
9 the limitation set forth herein shall be correspondingly ad-
10 justed: *Provided further*, That the Director of the Bureau of
11 the Budget shall report to the President and to the Congress
12 his estimate of the effect on budget outlays of other actions
13 by the Congress (whether initiated by the President or the
14 Congress) and the limitation set forth herein shall be corre-
15 spondingly adjusted: *Provided further*, That in the event the
16 President shall estimate and determine that total budget out-
17 lays cannot be held within the overall limitation provided
18 herein, he may, after notification in writing to the Congress
19 stating his reasons therefor, adjust the amount by not more
20 than one-half of 1 percent thereof.

21 (b) (1) In the event the President shall estimate and
22 determine that budget outlays during the fiscal year 1970 for
23 the following items (the expenditures for which arise under
24 appropriations or other authority not requiring annual action
25 by the Congress) appearing on page 49 of the Budget for
26 1971, namely:

(i) items designated "Social security, medicare, and other social insurance trust funds";

(ii) the item "National service life insurance (trust fund)";

(iii) the item "Interest"; and

(iv) the item "Farm price supports (Commodity Credit Corporation)"

will exceed the estimates included for such items in the Budget for 1971, the President may, after notification in writing to the Congress stating his reasons therefor, adjust accordingly the amount of the overall limitation provided in subsection (a).

(2) In the event the President shall estimate and determine that receipts (credited against budget outlays) during the fiscal year 1970 derived from:

(i) sales of financial assets of programs administered by the Farmers Home Administration, Export-Import Bank, agencies of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and the Veterans' Administration; and

(ii) leases of lands on the Outer Continental Shelf; will be less than the estimates included for such items in the Budget for 1971, the President may, after notification in writing to the Congress stating his reasons therefor, adjust accordingly the amount of the overall limitation provided in subsection (a).

1 (3) The aggregate amount of the adjustments made
2 pursuant to paragraphs (1) and (2) of this subsection shall
3 not exceed \$1,000,000,000.

4 (c) The Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall
5 make a preliminary report (by July 31, 1970) and a final
6 report (by December 31, 1970) to the President and the
7 Congress on the operation of this section.

8 TITLE V

9 LIMITATION ON FISCAL YEAR 1971 BUDGET

10 OUTLAYS

11 SEC. 501. (a) Expenditures and net lending (budget
12 outlays) of the Federal Government during the fiscal year
13 ending June 30, 1971, shall not exceed \$200,771,000,000:
14 *Provided*, That whenever action, or inaction, by the Con-
15 gress on requests for appropriations and other budgetary pro-
16 posals varies from the President's recommendations reflected
17 in the Budget for 1971 (H. Doc. 91-240, part 1), the Di-
18 rector of the Bureau of the Budget shall report to the Presi-
19 dent and to the Congress his estimate of the effect of such
20 action or inaction on budget outlays, and the limitation set
21 forth herein shall be correspondingly adjusted: *Provided*
22 *further*, That the Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall
23 report to the President and to the Congress his estimate of
24 the effect on budget outlays of other actions by the Congress
25 (whether initiated by the President or the Congress) and
26 the limitation set forth herein shall be correspondingly ad-

1 justed, and reports, so far as practicable, shall indicate
2 whether such other actions were initiated by the President
3 or by the Congress.

4 (b) (1) In the event the President shall estimate and
5 determine that budget outlays during the fiscal year 1971
6 for the following items (the expenditures for which arise
7 under appropriations or other authority not requiring an-
8 nual action by the Congress) appearing on page 49 of the
9 Budget for 1971, namely:

10 (i) items designated "Social security, medicare, and
11 other social insurance trust funds";

12 (ii) the item "National service life insurance
13 (trust fund)";

14 (iii) the item "Interest"; and

15 (iv) the item "Farm price supports (Commodity
16 Credit Corporation)";

17 will exceed the estimates included for such items in the
18 Budget for 1971, the President may, after notification in
19 writing to the Congress stating his reasons therefor, adjust
20 accordingly the amount of the overall limitation provided in
21 subsection (a).

22 (2) In the event the President shall estimate and deter-
23 mine that receipts (credited against budget outlays) during
24 the fiscal year 1971 derived from:

25 (i) sales of financial assets of programs adminis-
26 tered by the Farmers Home Administration, Export-

1 Import Bank, agencies of the Department of Housing
2 and Urban Development, and the Veterans' Adminis-
3 tration; and

4 (ii) leases of lands on the Outer Continental
5 Shelf;

6 will be less than the estimates included for such items in
7 the Budget for 1971, the President may, after notification
8 in writing to the Congress stating his reasons therefor, adjust
9 accordingly the amount of the overall limitation provided
10 in subsection (a).

(3) The aggregate amount of the adjustments made pursuant to paragraphs (1) and (2) of this subsection shall not exceed ~~\$3,000,000,000.~~ \$6,000,000,000.

(c) The Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall report periodically to the President and to the Congress on the operation of this section. Such reports shall be made at the end of each calendar month during the second session of the Ninety-first Congress and at the end of each calendar quarter thereafter.

TITLE VI

GENERAL PROVISIONS

22 SEC. 601. No part of any appropriation contained in this
23 Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current
24 fiscal year unless expressly so provided therein.

25 SEC. 602. Except where specifically increased or de-
26 creased elsewhere in this Act, the restrictions contained with-

1 in appropriations, or provisions affecting appropriations or
2 other funds, available during the fiscal year 1970, limiting
3 the amounts which may be expended for personal services,
4 or for purposes involving personal services, or amounts which
5 may be transferred between appropriations or authorizations
6 available for or involving such services, are hereby increased
7 to the extent necessary to meet increased pay costs author-
8 ized by or pursuant to law.

9 SEC. 603. None of the funds contained in this Act avail-
10 able to the Inter-American Bank shall be used directly or
11 indirectly as grants or loans to officers or members of the
12 staff of the Inter-American Bank.

13 *SEC. 604. Funds appropriated, or otherwise made avail-*
14 *able, by this Act for the fiscal year 1970, shall remain*
15 *available for obligation until July 1, 1970, or for five days*
16 *after the date of approval of this Act, whichever is later,*
17 *unless a longer period is specifically provided: Provided,*
18 *That all obligations incurred in anticipation of such appro-*
19 *priations and authority for the fiscal year 1970 as well*
20 *as those for longer periods as set forth herein are hereby*
21 *ratified and confirmed if in accordance with the terms hereof.*

Passed the House of Representatives May 7, 1970.

Attest:

W. PAT JENNINGS,

Clerk.

[Report No. 91-917]

AN ACT

Making supplemental appropriations for the
fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for
other purposes.

MAY 11, 1970

Read twice and referred to the Committee on
Appropriations

JUNE 8, 1970

Reported with amendments

June 11, 1970

14. WILDERNESS. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee reported, without amendment, S. 1732, to designate certain lands in the Craters of the Moon National Monument in Idaho as wilderness (S. Rept. No. 91-928). p. S8835
 15. PERSONNEL. The Post Office and Civil Service Committee voted to report with amendment (but did not actually report) S. 1772, providing that the Federal Government pay a portion of the cost of health insurance for Federal employees and annuitants. p. D613
 16. APPROPRIATIONS. Senators Mondale and Javits submitted amendments to H. R. 17339, the second supplemental appropriations bill for FY 70. pp. S8841-2
 17. PERSONNEL; TRAINING. Sen. Javits submitted an amendment to the proposed Manpower Training Act, S. 2838. pp. S8842-5
 18. BEEF IMPORTS. Sen. Hansen discussed the cost of beef and noted the impact of imported beef on the domestic ranchers and stockmen. pp. S8884-5
 19. FARM CREDIT BOARD. Sen. Tower praised the recent confirmation of Eldon G. Schuhart to the Federal Farm Credit Board. p. S8887
 20. ECONOMY. Sen. Harris inserted an article citing the need for wage-price controls to combat inflation. pp. S8903-5
 21. ELECTRIFICATION. Sen. Curtis inserted several winning essays in a contest sponsored by the Nebraska REA. pp. S8908-9
 22. FOOD. Sen. Mondale noted the forthcoming convening of the Second World Food Congress and urged continuing support of its efforts. pp. S8916-7
 23. EAST GREENACRES UNIT. Passed without amendment H. R. 9854, authorizing the construction, operation, and maintenance of the East Greenacres unit, Rathdrum Prairie project, Idaho. This bill now goes to the President. p. S8847
- EXTENSION OF REMARKS
24. INFORMATION; LISTS. Rep. Wold inserted a recent editorial supporting his opposition to the selling of lists by the IRS. pp. E5463-4
 25. BUDGET. Rep. Mahon inserted the latest "'budget scorekeeping report'" showing how the various actions of the Congress affect the President's budget estimates. pp. E5468-70
 26. ELECTRIFICATION. Representatives Denney and Martin inserted winning essays from a contest sponsored by the Nebraska REA. pp. E5479-81, 5494-6
 27. RECLAMATION. Rep. Burton, Utah, inserted an article regarding the progress of the Colorado River storage project. pp. E5486-7
 28. FARM PAYMENTS. Rep. Giaimo discussed and urged the limitation of farm payments. p. E5488
 29. DDT. Rep. Dingell inserted material dealing with "The Facts of DDT". pp. E5498-9
 30. TAXATION. Rep. Minshall discussed his bill to provide tax incentives for industrial and business pollution controls. pp. E5499-500.

BILLS INTRODUCED

31. LOANS. H. R. 18035, by Rep. Alexander; to amend the Truth in Lending Act to eliminate the inclusion of agricultural credit; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.
32. CONSERVATION. H. R. 18041, by Rep. Gonzalez; to establish a pilot program designated as the Youth Conservation Corps; to the Committee on Education and Labor.
33. INFORMATION; LISTS. H. R. 18041, by Rep. Horton; to limit the sale or distribution of mailing lists by Federal agencies; to the Committee on Government Operations.
34. ECOLOGY. H. R. 18043, by Rep. Murphy; to amend the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act to provide additional protection to marine and wildlife ecology by requiring the designation of certain water and submerged lands areas where the depositing of certain waste materials will be permitted, to authorize the establishment of standards with respect to such deposits; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.
35. LAND. H. R. 18044, by Rep. Ottinger; to designate certain lands as wilderness; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.
36. HOUSING. H. R. 18054, by Rep. Ottinger; to make available an additional \$10 billion for the low-income homeownership and rental housing programs; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.
37. PERSONNEL. H. R. 18057, by Rep. Whalen; to appropriate an additional amount to carry out section 102 of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962; to the Committee on Appropriations.
38. FISHERIES. S. 3947, by Sen. Magnuson; to amend the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Act of 1950 as amended, the North Pacific Fisheries Act of 1954 as amended; to the Committee on Commerce. Remarks of author pp. S8836-7
39. REDEVELOPMENT. S. J. Res. 210, by Sen. Mondale; to provide a one-year modification of designations of areas as redevelopment areas for the purposes of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965; to the Committee on Public Works. Remarks of author p. S8838
40. RECREATION. S. J. Res. 416, by Sen. Montoya; to develop Elephant Butte Reservoir for Recreational purposes. p. S8840

PRINTED HEARINGS RECEIVED IN THIS OFFICE

41. APPROPRIATIONS. Dept. of Transportation appropriations for 1971. Part 3. H. Appropriations Committee
Military construction appropriations for 1971. Part 1. H. Appropriations Committee

DIGEST of Congressional Proceedings

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

For actions of June 22, 1970
91st-2nd; No. 103

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(FOR INFORMATION ONLY;
NOT TO BE QUOTED OR CITED)

CONTENTS

Aging.....6	Foreign Trade.....23	Recreation.....3,7
Appropriations.....1	Golden Eagle.....7	Regional Development.....18
Conservation.....13	Highways.....17	Reimports.....8
Consumers.....14,22	Merchant Marine.....2	Rural Development.....12
Duty.....8	National Park.....16	Social Security.....5,21
Electrification.....4	Pesticides.....24	Solid Waste.....15
Environment.....11,20	Postal Reform.....19	Supplemental
Food.....25	Prices.....25	Appropriations.....1
Food Stamp.....1	Reclamation.....10	Walla-Walla Project.....9

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate passed second supplemental appropriations bill; adopted Ellender amendment providing additional funds for food stamp program. House passed bill restoring Golden Eagle program.

SENATE

1. APPROPRIATIONS. Passed H. R. 17399, the second supplemental appropriations bill, FY 70, including supplementals for pay costs, fighting forest fires, etc. (see Digest No. 94). Committee amendments were adopted en bloc. pp. S9497, S9498-528. Adopted the Ellender amendment providing \$300 million for the food stamp program for the period July 1-September 30, 1970. p. S9502
Conferees were appointed.
2. MERCHANT MARINE. A Commerce Committee subcommittee approved for full committee consideration H. R. 15424, with amendments, the proposed program to expand and improve the U.S. Merchant Marine. p. D663
3. RECREATION. Sen. Moss submitted an amendment to S. 27, establishing the Glen Canyon National Recreation Area in Arizona and Utah. p. S9532

4. ELECTRIFICATION. Received a report from the Administrator of REA on the approval of a loan to the Central Electric Power Cooperative, Inc., of Cayce, S. C., for the financing of certain transmission facilities; to the Committee on Appropriations. p. S9370
5. SOCIAL SECURITY. Sen. Williams, Del., submitted amendments to H. R. 17550, the proposed Social Security Amendments of 1970. p. S9376
6. AGING. Sen. Murphy inserted his address to the American Association of Retired Persons and a condensed version of the minority report of the Special Committee on Aging. pp. S9421-26

HOUSE

7. RECREATION. Passed with amendment S. 2315, restoring the Golden Eagle program to the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act. pp. H5863-8
8. REIMPORTS. Passed as reported H. R. 9183, providing that imported articles which are exported and thereafter reimported to the US for failure to meet sample or specifications, be entered free of duty upon such importation. pp. H5852-3
9. WALLA-WALLA PROJECT. Agreed to the conference report on S. 743, authorizing the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Touchet Division, Walla-Walla project, Oregon-Washington. p. H5860
10. RECLAMATION. Agreed to the conference report on S. 2062, differentiation between private and public ownership of lands in the administration of the acreage limitation provisions of Federal reclamation law. pp. H5860-1
11. ENVIRONMENT. Rep. Saylor inserted an article "Economics and the Environment". pp. H5885-87
12. RURAL DEVELOPMENT. Rep. Beville discussed the need for legislation to aid in rural development. pp. H5878-9
13. CONSERVATION. Rep. Hechler inserted a letter from West Virginia's Secretary of State urging the protection of the Otter Creek area in West Virginia. pp. H5890-1

BILLS INTRODUCED

14. CONSUMERS. H. R. 18152, by Rep. Fulton; amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to extend protection against fraudulent or deceptive practices, condemned by that act, to consumers through civil actions, to provide for class actions for acts in defraud of consumers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.
15. SOLID WASTE. H. R. 18163, by Rep. Springer; to amend the Solid Waste Disposal Act in order to provide financial assistance for the construction of solid waste disposal facilities, to improve research programs pursuant to such act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

91ST CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. R. 17399

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JUNE 22, 1970

Ordered to be printed with the amendments of the Senate numbered

AN ACT

Making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending
June 30, 1970, and for other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That the following sums are appropriated out of any money
4 in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to supply supple-
5 mental appropriations (this Act may be cited as the "Second
6 Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1970") for the fiscal year
7 ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes, namely:

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

TITLE I

CHAPTER I

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

EXTENSION SERVICE

COOPERATIVE EXTENSION WORK, PAYMENTS, AND

EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Cooperative extension work, payments and expenses" for "Retirement and employees' compensation costs for extension agents", not to exceed (1)\$~~597,000~~ \$425,000 to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Payments to States and Puerto Rico", fiscal year 1970.

(2)FOOD AND NUTRITION SERVICE

FOOD STAMP PROGRAM

For necessary expenses of the Food Stamp Program pursuant to the Food Stamp Act of 1964, as amended, for the period July 1, 1970, to September 30, 1970, \$300,000,000, to be charged to the amount appropriated under this head in H.R. 17923, when enacted.

CHAPTER II

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—MILITARY

RETIRED MILITARY PERSONNEL

RETIRED PAY, DEFENSE

For an additional amount for "Retired pay, Defense," \$99,000,000.

CHAPTER III

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

FEDERAL FUNDS

(3) FEDERAL PAYMENT TO DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

For an additional amount for "Federal payment to the District of Columbia", to be paid to the general fund of the District of Columbia \$5,831,000.

LOANS TO THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FOR CAPITAL

OUTLAY

For an additional amount for "Loans to the District of Columbia for capital outlay", \$1,293,000, to remain available until expended and to be advanced to the general fund upon request of the Commissioner.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FUNDS

GENERAL OPERATING EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "General operating expenses", (4)\$2,675 \$174,675.

PUBLIC SAFETY

For an additional amount for "Public safety", including purchase of sixty passenger motor vehicles for police-type use which may exceed the general purchase price limitation for the current fiscal year by not in excess of \$400 per vehicle, (5)\$2,370,500 \$3,966,485.

(6)For an additional amount for "Public safety" as may be necessary to assist in meeting costs associated with salary

1 *increases for policemen and firemen for the period July 1,*
 2 *1969, to December 31, 1969, \$1,789,000.*

3 The limitation on the expenditure of funds by the Chief
 4 of Police for prevention and detection of crime during the cur-
 5 rent fiscal year shall be \$100,000.

6 PARKS AND RECREATION

7 For an additional amount for "Parks and recreation",
 8 ~~(7)\$47,300~~ \$171,750.

9 (8)SETTLEMENT OF CLAIMS AND SUITS

10 *For payment of property damage claims in excess of*
 11 *\$500 and of personal injury claims in excess of \$1,000,*
 12 *approved by the Commissioner in accordance with the pro-*
 13 *visions of the Act of February 11, 1929, as amended (45*
 14 *Stat. 1160; 46 Stat. 500; 65 Stat. 131), \$20,000, payable*
 15 *from the general fund.*

16 CAPITAL OUTLAY

17 For an additional amount for "Capital outlay", to remain
 18 available until expended, ~~(9)\$1,658,000~~ \$8,768,000 (10):
 19 *Provided, That \$374,500 shall be available for construction*
 20 *services by the Director of General Services or by contract*
 21 *for architectural engineering services, as may be determined*
 22 *by the Commissioner.*

23 DIVISION OF EXPENSES

24 The sums appropriated herein for the District of Colum-
 25 bia shall be paid out of the general fund of the District of
 26 Columbia, except as otherwise specifically provided.

CHAPTER IV

FOREIGN OPERATIONS

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL INSTITUTION

INVESTMENT IN INTER-AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK

For an additional amount for subscription to the Inter-American Development Bank, to remain available until expended, \$205,880,000, for the second of two installments of the United States share in the authorized increase in callable capital stock of the Bank.

CHAPTER V

INDEPENDENT OFFICES

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

FEDERAL LABOR RELATIONS COUNCIL

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

The limitation heretofore provided on the rate of compensation for the public members of the Federal Service Impasses Panel is increased to a rate of not to exceed the per diem rate equivalent to the rate for grade GS-18.

(11) *PAYMENT TO CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT AND
DISABILITY FUND*

For an additional amount for "Payment to civil service retirement and disability fund", as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 8348, \$157,816,600, to be credited to the civil service retirement and disability fund.

1 COMMISSION ON POPULATION GROWTH AND

2 THE AMERICAN FUTURE

3 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

4 For expenses necessary for the Commission on Popula-
 5 tion Growth and the American Future, including services as
 6 authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, and hire of passenger motor
 7 vehicles, \$965,000, to remain available until expended.

8 (12) GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

9 REAL PROPERTY ACTIVITIES

10 SITES AND EXPENSES, PUBLIC BUILDINGS PROJECTS

11 For an additional amount for "Sites and expenses, pub-
 12 lic buildings projects", \$371,000, to remain available until
 13 expended.

14 (13) NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

15 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

16 For expenses necessary to carry out the purposes of the
 17 National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended (42
 18 U.S.C. 1861-1875), \$8,800,000, to remain available until
 19 expended.

20 SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

21 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

22 For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses",

23 (14) \$7,000,000 \$7,433,000.

1 VETERANS ADMINISTRATION

2 COMPENSATION AND PENSIONS

3 For an additional amount for "Compensation and pen-
4 sions", \$273,045,000, to remain available until expended.

5 READJUSTMENT BENEFITS

6 For an additional amount for "Readjustment benefits",
7 \$327,500,000, to remain available until expended.

8 MEDICAL CARE

9 For an additional amount for "Medical care", \$113,-
10 500,000.

11 EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

12 (15) COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

13 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

14 For expenses necessary for the Council on Environ-
15 mental Quality in carrying out its functions under the Na-
16 tional Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (Public Law 91-
17 190), including hire of passenger motor vehicles and partial
18 support of the cabinet committee on environmental quality,
19 and the Citizens' Advisory Committee on Environmental
20 Quality, established by Executive Order 11472 of May 29,
21 1969, or any amendatory order, \$100,000.

1 COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY AND OFFICE OF
2 ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY
3 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

4 For expenses necessary for the Council on Environ-
5 mental Quality and the Office of Environmental Quality,
6 in carrying out their functions under the National Environ-
7 mental Policy Act of 1969 (Public Law 91-190) and the
8 Environmental Quality Improvement Act of 1970 (Public
9 Law 91-224), including hire of passenger vehicles, and
10 partial support of the Cabinet Committee on the Environment
11 and the Citizen's Advisory Committee on Environmental
12 Quality, established by Executive Order 11472 of May 29,
13 1969, as amended by Executive Order 11514 of March 5,
14 1970, \$400,000.

15 FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT
16 DISASTER RELIEF

17 For an additional amount for "Disaster Relief", \$75,-
18 000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That
19 not to exceed 3 per centum of the foregoing amount shall
20 be available for administrative expenses.

1 DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN

2 DEVELOPMENT

3 RENEWAL AND HOUSING ASSISTANCE

4 (16) URBAN RENEWAL PROGRAMS

5 *For grants for urban renewal, fiscal year 1970, as an*
6 *additional amount for urban renewal programs, as author-*
7 *ized by title I of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended (42*
8 *U.S.C. 1450 et seq.) and section 314 of the Housing Act of*
9 *1954, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1452a), \$587,500,000, to*
10 *remain available until expended: Provided, That no part of*
11 *any appropriation in this Act shall be used for administra-*
12 *tive expenses in connection with commitments for grants*
13 *aggregating more than the total of amounts available in the*
14 *current year from the amounts authorized for making such*
15 *commitments through June 30, 1967, plus the additional*
16 *amounts appropriated therefor.*

17 LOW RENT PUBLIC HOUSING ANNUAL CONTRIBUTIONS

18 *For an additional amount for "Low-rent public housing*
19 *annual contributions", fiscal year 1969, \$13,616,000.*

1

COLLEGE HOUSING

2

3 The limitation on total payments that may be required
4 in any fiscal year by all contracts for annual grants with
5 educational institutions entered into pursuant to Section 401
6 of the Housing Act of 1950, as amended (82 Stat. 604),
7 is increased by \$5,000,000.

7

MORTGAGE CREDIT

8

FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

9

HOMEOWNERSHIP AND RENTAL HOUSING ASSISTANCE

10

11 The limitation on total payments that may be required
12 in any fiscal year by all contracts entered into under section
13 235 of the National Housing Act, as amended (82 Stat.
14 477), is increased by \$35,000,000, and the limitation on
15 total payments under those entered into under section 236
16 of such Act (82 Stat. 498), is increased by \$35,000,000.

16

CHAPTER VI

17

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

18

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

19

MANAGEMENT OF LANDS AND RESOURCES

20

21 For an additional amount for "Management of lands and
resources," \$23,790,000.

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

RESOURCES MANAGEMENT

For an additional amount for "Resources management,"
\$700,000.

BUREAU OF OUTDOOR RECREATION

LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION

For an additional amount for "Land and Water Conservation," to remain available until expended, \$7,100,000.
to be derived from the Land and Water Conservation Fund,
and to be available to the National Park Service for property
acquisition authorized by the act of September 13, 1962
(Public Law 87-657), as amended.

OFFICE OF TERRITORIES

ADMINISTRATION OF TERRITORIES

For an additional amount for "Administration of Territories," \$275,000, to remain available until expended.

(17) GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

SURVEYS, INVESTIGATIONS, AND RESEARCH

For an additional amount for "Surveys, investigations,
and research", \$225,000.

1 NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

2 MANAGEMENT AND PROTECTION

3 For an additional amount for "Management and Pro-
4 tection," (18)~~\$850,000~~ \$775,000.

5 RELATED AGENCIES

6 DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

7 FOREST SERVICE

8 FOREST PROTECTION AND UTILIZATION

9 For an additional amount for "Forest protection and
10 utilization," for "Forest land management", (19)~~\$21,000,-~~
11 ~~000~~ \$21,172,000 (20), including \$172,000 to remain avail-
12 able until expended.

13 NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE
14 HUMANITIES

15 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

16 In addition to amounts heretofore appropriated under
17 this heading there are appropriated amounts equal to the
18 total amount of gifts, bequests, and devises of money, and
19 other property received by each Endowment, during the cur-
20 rent and preceding fiscal years, under the provisions of sec-
21 tion 10 (a) (2) of the National Foundation on the Arts and
22 Humanities Act of 1965, as amended, but not to exceed a
23 total of \$2,000,000, to remain available until expended.

CHAPTER VII

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

(21) MANPOWER ADMINISTRATION

MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING ACTIVITIES

For an additional amount for "Manpower development and training activities", to carry out the provisions of section 102 of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, as amended, \$100,000,000 to remain available until September 30, 1970: Provided, That this appropriation shall not be available for the purposes of sections 106(d) and 309(b) of said Act.

BUREAU OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

AND EX-SERVICEMEN

For an additional amount for "Unemployment compensation for Federal employees and ex-servicemen", \$50,000,000.

(22) TRADE ADJUSTMENT ACTIVITIES

For an additional amount for "Trade Adjustment Activities", \$2,330,000, together with such amount as may be necessary to be charged to the subsequent year appropriation for these expenses for any period subsequent to March 31 of the current year.

1 LIMITATION ON GRANTS TO STATES FOR UNEMPLOYMENT
2 COMPENSATION AND EMPLOYMENT SERVICE ADMINIS-
3 TRATION

4 For an additional amount for "Limitation on grants to
5 States for unemployment compensation and employment
6 service administration", \$10,000,000, to be expended from
7 the employment security administration account in the
8 Unemployment Trust fund.

9 WAGE AND LABOR STANDARDS ADMINISTRATION
10 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

11 For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses",
12 \$37,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$43,000 may be
13 transferred from the amounts herein and heretofore appro-
14 priated for "Salaries and expenses" for the current fiscal year
15 to the fund created by section 44 of the Longshoremen's and
16 Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, as amended.

17 OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

18 FEDERAL CONTRACT COMPLIANCE AND CIVIL RIGHTS
19 PROGRAM

20 For an additional amount for "Federal contract compli-
21 ance and civil rights program, salaries and expenses",
22 \$107,000.

1 DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND
2 WELFARE

3 (23) HOSPITAL MODERNIZATION AND CONSTRUCTION

4 For an additional amount for grants or loans for specific
5 hospitals and related facilities pursuant to section 601(b) of
6 the Public Health Service Act, \$8,703,078; without regard
7 to the allotments and property provisions of title VI of the
8 Public Health Service Act.

9 SOCIAL AND REHABILITATION SERVICE

10 GRANTS TO STATES FOR PUBLIC ASSISTANCE

11 For an additional amount for "Grants to States for
12 public assistance," \$146,753,000.

13 SPECIAL INSTITUTIONS

14 HOWARD UNIVERSITY

15 CONSTRUCTION

16 For an additional amount for "Construction", \$7,700,-
17 000, to remain available until expended.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

CHAPTER VIII

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

(24) SENATE

CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE SENATE

INQUIRIES AND INVESTIGATIONS

For an additional amount for "Inquiries and Investigations", fiscal year 1970, \$345,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation, "Salaries, Officers and Employees", fiscal year 1970.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SALARIES, MILEAGE FOR THE MEMBERS, AND EXPENSE

ALLOWANCE OF THE SPEAKER

COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS

For an additional amount for "Compensation of members", \$47,000.

SALARIES, OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

For an additional amount for "Committee on Appropriations", \$35,555.

CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE HOUSE

MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS

For an additional amount for "Miscellaneous items", \$50,000.

SPECIAL AND SELECT COMMITTEES

For an additional amount for "Special and select committees", \$100,000, to remain available until expended under the provisions of House Resolution 710, Ninety-first Congress.

GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", \$499,000.

CHAPTER IX

PUBLIC WORKS

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

COLORADO RIVER BASIN PROJECT

For an additional amount for "Colorado River Basin Project", to remain available until expended, \$6,563,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Construction and rehabilitation".

CHAPTER X

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND CONFERENCES

CONTRIBUTIONS TO INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

For an additional amount for "Contributions to international organizations", \$1,600,000.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

(25) LEGAL ACTIVITIES AND GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

FEES AND EXPENSES OF WITNESSES

For an additional amount for "Fees and expenses of witnesses", \$500,000.

IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses, Immigration and Naturalization Service", \$892,000.

(26) FEDERAL PRISON SYSTEM

Support of United States Prisoners

For an additional amount for "Support of United States prisoners", \$850,000.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

NINETEENTH DECENNIAL CENSUS

For an additional amount for the "Nineteenth decennial census", \$11,000,000, to remain available until December 31, 1972.

OFFICE OF FIELD SERVICES

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", \$105,000.

(27) MARITIME ADMINISTRATION

STATE MARINE SCHOOLS

*For an additional amount for "State Marine Schools",
for maintenance and repair of vessels loaned by the United
States for use in connection with such State marine schools,
\$145,000.*

THE JUDICIARY

CUSTOMS COURT

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses",
\$18,000.

COURTS OF APPEALS, DISTRICT COURTS, AND OTHER

JUDICIAL SERVICES

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, UNITED STATES MAGISTRATES

For "Salaries and expenses, United States magistrates",
\$550,000.

FEES AND EXPENSES OF COURT-APPOINTED COUNSEL

For an additional amount for "Fees and expenses of
court-appointed counsel", \$1,150,000.

For an additional amount for "Fees and expenses of
court-appointed counsel", \$300,000, fiscal year 1969.

FEES OF JURORS AND COMMISSIONERS

For an additional amount for "Fees of jurors and com-
missioners", \$500,000.

1 TRAVEL AND MISCELLANEOUS EXPENSES

2 For an additional amount for "Travel and miscellaneous
3 expenses", \$500,000.

4 ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES COURTS

5 For an additional amount for "Administrative Office of
6 the United States Courts", \$15,000.

7 RELATED AGENCIES

8 (28) DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION,

9 AND WELFARE

10 OFFICE OF EDUCATION

11 CIVIL RIGHTS EDUCATION

12 For an additional amount for "Civil Rights Education",
13 including not to exceed \$250,000 for salaries and expenses
14 \$5,000,000.

15 CHAPTER XI

16 DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

17 COAST GUARD

18 RETIRED PAY

19 For an additional amount for "Retired pay", (29)\$1,
20 ~~250,000~~ \$1,000,000.

21 RELATED AGENCY

22 WASHINGTON METROPOLITAN AREA TRANSIT AUTHORITY

23 FEDERAL CONTRIBUTION

24 For an additional amount for "Federal contribution",
25 to enable the Department of Transportation to pay the

1 Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority an addi-
 2 tional contribution for the rail rapid transit system, as au-
 3 thorized by the National Capital Transportation Act of 1969,
 4 (Public Law 91-143), \$82,939,000, to remain available
 5 until expended.

6 CHAPTER XII

7 TREASURY DEPARTMENT

8 (30) BUREAU OF ACCOUNTS

9 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

10 *For an additional amount for, "Salaries and expenses",*
 11 *\$1,300,000.*

12 BUREAU OF THE PUBLIC DEBT

13 ADMINISTERING THE PUBLIC DEBT

14 *For an additional amount for "Administering the public*
 15 *debt", (31) ~~\$3,250,000~~ \$3,600,000.*

16 POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

17 (Out of Postal Fund)

18 TRANSPORTATION

19 *For an additional amount for "Transportation",*
 20 *(32) ~~\$10,700,000~~ \$10,600,000.*

21 RELATED AGENCIES

22 TAX COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

23 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

24 *For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses",*
 25 *(33) ~~\$83,000~~ \$67,000.*

1

CHAPTER XIII

2

CLAIMS AND JUDGMENTS

3

4 For payment of claims settled and determined by de-
5 partments and agencies in accord with law and judgments
6 rendered against the United States by the United States
7 Court of Claims and United States district courts, as set forth
8 in House Document Numbered 91-135, Ninety-first Con-
9 gress, (34) *and Senate Document Numbered 91-86 Ninety-*
10 *first Congress, (35) \$6,591,406, \$23,478,461* together with
11 such amounts as may be necessary to pay interest (as and
12 when specified in such judgments or provided by law) and
13 such additional sums due to increases in rates of exchanges as
14 may be necessary to pay claims in foreign currency: *Pro-*
15 *vided*, That no judgment herein appropriated for shall be paid
16 until it shall become final and conclusive against the United
17 States by failure of the parties to appeal or otherwise: *Pro-*
18 *vided further*, That unless otherwise specifically required by
19 law or by judgment, payment of interest wherever appropri-
20 ated for herein shall not continue for more than thirty days
after the date of approval of the Act.

21

TITLE II

22

INCREASED PAY COSTS

23

24 For additional amounts for appropriations for the fiscal
25 year 1970, for increased pay costs authorized by or pursuant
to law, as follows:

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

(36) SENATE

"Compensation of the Vice President and Senators",

\$10,835;

"Salaries, officers and employees", \$3,634,674;

"Office of the Legislative Counsel of the Senate",

\$39,120;

Contingent expenses of the Senate:

"Senate policy committees", \$47,120;

"Automobiles and maintenance", \$4,140;

"Inquiries and investigations", \$662,515; including \$23,695 for the Committee on Appropriations;

"Folding documents", \$4,660;

"Miscellaneous items", \$92,810;

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

"Office of the Parliamentarian", \$10,865;

"Compilation of precedents of House of Representatives", \$1,330;

"Office of the Chaplain", \$1,805;

"Office of the Clerk", \$100,000;

"Office of the Sergeant at Arms", \$250,000;

"Office of the Doorkeeper", \$120,000;

"Office of the Postmaster", \$62,900;

"Committee employees", \$700,000;

Special and minority employees:

- 1 "House Democratic steering committee", \$1,310;
- 2 "House Republican conference", \$1,310;
- 3 "Majority leader", \$8,135;
- 4 "Minority leader", \$7,265;
- 5 "Majority whip", \$5,525;
- 6 "Minority whip", \$5,525;
- 7 "Official reporters of debates", \$32,605;
- 8 "Official reporters to committees", \$32,370;
- 9 "Committee on Appropriations", \$89,445;
- 10 "Office of the legislative counsel", \$23,400;
- 11 "Members' clerk hire", \$850,000;

12 Contingent expenses of the House:

- 13 "Government contributions", \$760,000, and in
- 14 addition such amount as may be necessary may be
- 15 transferred from the appropriation for "miscellane-
- 16 ous items";

17 "Speaker's automobile", \$1,500;

18 "Majority leader's automobile", \$1,500;

19 "Minority leader's automobile", \$1,500;

20 Joint items:

21 Contingent expenses of the Senate:

22 "Joint Economic Committee", (37)\$44,490
 23 \$43,475;

24 "Joint Committee on Atomic Energy",
 25 \$32,460;

1 “Joint Committee on Printing”, \$15,175;

2 Contingent expenses of the House:

3 “Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Tax-
4 ation”, \$10,065;

5 “Joint Committee on Defense Production”,
6 \$10,850;

7 ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

8 Office of the Architect of the Capitol: “Salaries”,
9 \$56,000.

10 Capitol buildings and grounds:

11 “Capitol buildings”, \$55,500;

12 “Capitol grounds”, \$28,200;

13 (38)“Senate office buildings”, \$146,300

14 “Senate garage”, \$3,400;

15 “House office buildings”, \$120,000;

16 “Capitol power plant”, \$20,800;

17 Library buildings and grounds: “Structural and me-
18 chanical care”, \$10,000.

19 BOTANIC GARDEN

20 “Salaries and expenses”, \$24,000;

21 LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

22 “Salaries and expenses”, \$1,313,500;

23 Copyright Office: “Salaries and expenses”, \$274,000

24 Legislative Reference Service: “Salaries and expenses”,
25 \$414,000;

1 Distribution of catalog cards: "Salaries and expenses",
 2 \$159,000, and in addition the reserve fund of \$200,000
 3 under this head, fiscal year 1970, may be used for increased
 4 pay costs;

5 Books for the blind and physically handicapped: "Sal-
 6 aries and expenses", \$33,000;

7 Organizing and microfilming the papers of the Presi-
 8 dents: "Salaries and expenses", \$13,200;

9 "Collection and distribution of library materials (special
 10 foreign currency program)", \$14,000;

11 GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

12 Office of Superintendent of Documents: "Salaries and
 13 expenses", \$395,400, and in addition the reserve fund of
 14 \$200,000 under this head, fiscal year 1970, may be used
 15 for pay costs;

16 GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

17 "Salaries and expenses", \$5,142,000;

18 THE JUDICIARY

19 SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

20 "Salaries", \$194,000;

21 "Care of the building and grounds", \$21,700;

22 COURT OF CUSTOMS AND PATENT APPEALS

23 "Salaries and expenses", \$22,000;

24 CUSTOMS COURT

25 "Salaries and expenses", \$128,500;

1 COURTS OF APPEALS, DISTRICT COURTS, AND OTHER
2 JUDICIAL SERVICES

3 "Salaries of supporting personnel", \$4,370,000;

4 "Administrative Office of the United States Courts",
5 \$190,000, of which \$20,000 shall be derived by transfer
6 from the appropriation for "Expenses of referees";

7 "Expenses of referees", \$608,000;

8 EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

9 The White House Office: "Salaries and expenses",
10 \$310,000;

11 "Operating expenses, Executive Mansion", \$48,000;

12 BUREAU OF THE BUDGET

13 "Salaries and expenses", \$491,000;

14 COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS

15 "Salaries and expenses", \$50,000;

16 NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE COUNCIL

17 "Salaries and expenses", \$49,000;

18 OFFICE OF EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS

19 "Salaries and expenses", \$290,000;

20 SPECIAL REPRESENTATIVE FOR TRADE NEGOTIATIONS

21 "Salaries and expenses", \$51,000;

22 FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

23 PEACE CORPS

24 "Salaries and expenses": (Increase of \$1,651,000 in
25 the limitation on administrative expenses) ;

1 FOREIGN ASSISTANCE: ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE

2 "Administrative expenses", \$3,200,000, to be derived
3 by transfer from appropriations for "Economic assistance",
4 fiscal year 1970;

5 "Administrative and other expenses": \$200,000, to be
6 derived by transfer from appropriations for "Economic as-
7 sistance", fiscal year 1970;

8 DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

9 AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH SERVICE

10 "Salaries and expenses", for "Research", \$8,381,000,
11 and for "Plant and animal disease and pest control",
12 \$5,119,000;

13 COOPERATIVE STATE RESEARCH SERVICE

14 "Payments and expenses", \$130,000;

15 EXTENSION SERVICE

16 "Cooperative extension work, payments and expenses",
17 for "Federal Extension Service", \$250,000;

18 FARMER COOPERATIVE SERVICE

19 "Salaries and expenses", \$131,000;

20 SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

21 "Conservation operations", \$9,450,000;

22 "River basin surveys and investigations", \$652,000, to
23 remain available until expended;

24 "Watershed planning", \$491,000, to remain available
25 until expended;

1 “Watershed works of improvement”, \$2,159,000, to re-
2 main available until expended;

3 “Flood prevention”, \$815,000, to remain available
4 until expended;

5 “Great plains conservation program”, \$342,000, to re-
6 main available until expended;

7 “Resource conservation and development”, \$573,000,
8 to remain available until expended;

9 ECONOMIC RESEARCH SERVICE

10 “Salaries and expenses”, \$1,142,000;

11 STATISTICAL REPORTING SERVICE

12 “Salaries and expenses”, \$1,116,000;

13 CONSUMER AND MARKETING SERVICE

14 “Consumer protective, marketing, and regulatory pro-
15 grams”, \$5,250,000;

16 FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL SERVICE

17 “Salaries and expenses”, \$600,000;

18 COMMODITY EXCHANGE AUTHORITY

19 “Salaries and expenses”, \$170,000;

20 AGRICULTURAL STABILIZATION AND CONSERVATION
21 SERVICE

22 “Expenses, Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation
23 Service”, \$7,899,000, of which \$600,000 shall be derived
24 by transfer from the appropriation for “Conservation re-

1 serve program", fiscal year 1970, and \$1,299,000 from the
2 Commodity Credit Corporation Fund;

3 OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

4 "Salaries and expenses", \$1,022,000;

5 PACKERS AND STOCKYARDS ADMINISTRATION

6 "Salaries and expenses", \$154,000;

7 OFFICE OF THE GENERAL COUNSEL

8 "Salaries and expenses", \$427,000;

9 OFFICE OF INFORMATION

10 "Salaries and expenses", \$150,000;

11 NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL LIBRARY

12 "Salaries and expenses", \$175,000;

13 OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT SERVICES

14 "Salaries and expenses", \$237,000;

15 GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

16 "Salaries and expenses", \$425,000;

17 RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

18 "Salaries and expenses", \$1,075,000;

19 FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION

20 "Salaries and expenses", \$5,200,000;

21 FOREST SERVICE

22 "Forest protection and utilization", \$10,266,000;

23 FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE CORPORATION

24 "Administrative and operating expenses", \$691,000,

25 which may be paid from premium income;

1 DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

2 GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

3 "Salaries and expenses", \$604,000;

4 OFFICE OF BUSINESS ECONOMICS

5 "Salaries and expenses," \$238,000;

6 BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

7 "Salaries and expenses", \$1,141,000;

8 "Nineteenth decennial census", \$6,722,000, to remain

9 available until December 31, 1972;

10 "1967 economic censuses", \$282,000, to remain avail-

11 able until December 31, 1970;

12 ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION

13 "Operations and administration", \$1,121,000;

14 BUSINESS AND DEFENSE SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

15 "Salaries and expenses", \$505,000;

16 INTERNATIONAL ACTIVITIES

17 "Salaries and expenses", \$835,000;

18 "Export control", \$446,000;

19 OFFICE OF FIELD SERVICES

20 "Salaries and expenses", \$389,000;

21 MINORITY BUSINESS ENTERPRISE

22 "Salaries and expenses", \$94,000;

23 FOREIGN DIRECT INVESTMENT CONTROL

24 "Salaries and expenses", \$100,000;

1 ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCE SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

2 "Salaries and expenses", \$8,040,000;

3 "Research and development", \$1,239,000, to remain
4 available until expended;

5 "Satellite operations", \$421,000, to remain available un-
6 til expended;

7 PATENT OFFICE

8 "Salaries and expenses", \$3,135,000;

9 NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS

10 "Research and technical services", \$2,187,000;

11 MARITIME ADMINISTRATION

12 "Salaries and expenses", for administrative expenses,
13 \$746,000;

14 "Maritime training", \$204,000;

15 DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—MILITARY

16 MILITARY PERSONNEL

17 "Military personnel, Army", \$538,000,000;

18 "Military personnel, Navy", \$360,000,000;

19 "Military personnel, Marine Corps", \$123,300,000;

20 "Military personnel, Air Force", (39)\$485,000,000
21 \$502,500,000;

22 "Reserve personnel, Army", \$22,900,000;

23 "Reserve personnel, Navy", \$6,000,000;

24 "Reserve personnel, Marine Corps", \$4,000,000;

25 "National Guard personnel, Army", \$33,500,000;

26 "National Guard personnel, Air Force", \$10,000,000;

1 RETIRED MILITARY PERSONNEL

2 "Retired pay, Defense", \$25,000,000;

3 OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

4 "Operation and maintenance, Army", (40)\$196,480,-
5 000 \$206,900,000;

6 "Operation and maintenance, Navy", (41)\$157,800,-
7 000 \$166,100,000;

8 "Operation and maintenance, Marine Corps", \$7,000,-
9 000;

10 "Operation and maintenance, Air Force", \$84,200,000;

11 "Operation and maintenance, Defense agencies", (42)
12 \$70,400,000 \$74,200,000;

13 "Operation and maintenance, Army National Guard",
14 (43)\$13,800,000 \$14,800,000;

15 "Operation and maintenance, Air National Guard",
16 \$12,250,000;

17 "Court of Military Appeals", \$70,000;

18 CIVIL DEFENSE

19 "Operation and maintenance", \$850,000;

20 DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

21 DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

22 CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

23 "Operation and maintenance, general", \$6,905,000;

24 "General expenses", \$2,000,000;

25 RYUKYU ISLANDS, ARMY

26 "Administration", \$200,000;

1 U.S. SOLDIERS' HOME

2 "Operation and maintenance", \$296,000;

3 THE PANAMA CANAL

4 CANAL ZONE GOVERNMENT

5 "Operating expenses", \$963,000;

6 PANAMA CANAL COMPANY

7 "Limitation on general and administrative expenses",
8 (Increase of \$605,000 in the limitation on general and ad-
9 ministrative expenses) ;

10 DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND
11 WELFARE

12 CONSUMER PROTECTION AND ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH
13 SERVICE

14 "Food and drug control", \$2,294,000, to be derived by
15 transfer from the appropriation for "Health services research
16 and development", fiscal year 1970;

17 "Air pollution control", \$1,062,000, to be derived by
18 transfer from the appropriation for "Comprehensive health
19 planning and services", fiscal year 1970;

20 "Environmental control", \$757,000, to be derived by
21 transfer from the appropriation for "Regional medical pro-
22 grams", fiscal year 1970;

23 "Office of the Administrator, salaries and expenses",
24 \$354,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation

1 for "National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases",
2 fiscal year 1970;

3 HEALTH SERVICES AND MENTAL HEALTH

4 ADMINISTRATION

5 "Mental health", \$358,000, to be derived by transfer
6 from the appropriation for "National Institute of Allergy and
7 Infectious Diseases", fiscal year 1970;

8 "Saint Elizabeths Hospital", \$2,519,000, to be derived
9 by transfer from the appropriation for "National Institute of
10 Neurological Diseases and Stroke", fiscal year 1970;

11 "Communicable diseases", \$2,446,000, to be derived by
12 transfer from the appropriation for "Maternal and child
13 health and welfare", fiscal year 1970;

14 "Hospital construction", \$208,000, to be derived by
15 transfer from the appropriation for "National Institute of
16 Arthritis and Metabolic Diseases", fiscal year 1970;

17 "Patient care and special health services", \$5,241,000,
18 to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "National
19 Institute of Arthritis and Metabolic Diseases", fiscal year
20 1970;

21 "National health statistics", \$329,000, to be derived by
22 transfer from the appropriation for "National Institute of
23 Arthritis and Metabolic Diseases", fiscal year 1970;

24 "Indian health services", \$4,464,000, to be derived by

1 transfer from the appropriation for "National Institute of
2 General Medical Sciences", fiscal year 1970;

3 "Office of the Administrator, salaries and expenses",
4 \$691,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation
5 for "National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Stroke",
6 fiscal year 1970;

7 NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

8 "Office of the Director, Salaries and expenses", \$218,-
9 000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for
10 "National Institute of General Medical Sciences", fiscal year
11 1970;

12 OFFICE OF EDUCATION

13 "School assistance in federally affected areas", \$14,000,
14 to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Re-
15 search and training, Office of Education", fiscal year 1970;

16 "Libraries and community services", \$300,000, to be
17 derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Research
18 and training, Office of Education", fiscal year 1970;

19 "Salaries and expenses", \$2,528,000, to be derived by
20 transfer from the appropriation for "Research and training,
21 Office of Education", fiscal year 1970;

22 SOCIAL AND REHABILITATION SERVICE

23 "Salaries and expenses", \$2,496,000, to be derived by
24 transfer from the appropriation for "National Institute of
25 Allergy and Infectious Diseases", fiscal year 1970;

26 "Assistance to refugees in the United States", \$90,000,

1 to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Na-
 2 tional Institute of Neurological Diseases and Stroke", fiscal
 3 year 1970;

4 SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

5 "Limitation on salaries and expenses (trust fund)" (In-
 6 crease of \$21,276,000 in the limitation on "Salaries and ex-
 7 penses") ;

8 SPECIAL INSTITUTIONS

9 "Model Secondary School for the Deaf, salaries and ex-
 10 penses", \$12,000, to be derived by transfer from the appro-
 11 priation for "National Institute of Neurological Diseases and
 12 Stroke", fiscal year 1970;

13 "Gallaudet College, salaries and expenses", \$162,000,
 14 to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Na-
 15 tional Institute of Neurological Diseases and Stroke", fiscal
 16 year 1970;

17 "Howard University, salaries and expenses", \$664,000,
 18 to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Com-
 19 prehensive health planning and services", fiscal year 1970;

20 "Freedmen's Hospital", \$766,000, to be derived by
 21 transfer from the appropriation for "comprehensive health
 22 planning and services", fiscal year 1970;

23 DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT

24 "Office of the Secretary, salaries and expenses",
 25 \$451,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation

1 for "Comprehensive health planning and services", fiscal
2 year 1970;

3 "Office for Civil Rights, salaries and expenses", \$496,-
4 000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for
5 "Comprehensive health planning and services", fiscal year
6 1970;

7 "Office of Community and Field Services, salaries and
8 expenses", \$607,000, to be derived by transfer from the
9 appropriation for "Comprehensive health planning and serv-
10 ices", fiscal year 1970;

11 "Office of the Comptroller, salaries and expenses",
12 \$1,018,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropria-
13 tion for "Comprehensive health planning and services", fiscal
14 year 1970;

15 "Office of the Administrator, salaries and expenses",
16 \$476,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation
17 for "Comprehensive health planning and services", fiscal
18 year 1970;

19 "Surplus property utilization", \$107,000, to be derived
20 by transfer from the appropriation for "Comprehensive
21 health planning and services", fiscal year 1970;

22 "Office of the General Counsel, salaries and expenses",
23 \$337,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation
24 for "Comprehensive health planning and services", fiscal
25 year 1970;

1 DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN
2 DEVELOPMENT

3 RENEWAL AND HOUSING ASSISTANCE

4 "Salaries and expenses", \$2,508,000;

5 METROPOLITAN DEVELOPMENT

6 "Salaries and expenses", \$480,700;

7 MODEL CITIES AND GOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

8 "Salaries and expenses", \$27,600, together with not to
9 exceed \$400,900, to be derived by transfer from the appro-
10 priation for "Model cities programs" fiscal year 1970;

11 FEDERAL INSURANCE ADMINISTRATION

12 "Flood insurance", \$28,500;

13 FAIR HOUSING AND EQUAL OPPORTUNITY

14 "Fair housing and equal opportunity", \$391,400.

15 DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT

16 "General administration", \$559,500;

17 "Regional management and services", \$655,000;

18 "Limitation on administrative expenses, college housing
19 loans" (Increase of \$75,000 in the limitation on administra-
20 tive expenses) ;

21 "Limitation on administrative expenses, public facility
22 loans" (Increase of \$55,000 in the limitation on adminis-
23 trative expenses) ;

24 "Limitation on administrative expenses, revolving fund

1 (liquidating programs)'' (Increase of \$6,700 in the limita-
 2 tion on administrative expenses) ;

3 "Limitation on administrative and nonadministrative ex-
 4 penses, Federal housing administration'' (Increase of \$450,-
 5 000 in the limitation on administrative expenses and increase
 6 of \$5,175,000 in the limitation on nonadministrative ex-
 7 penses) ;

8 DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

9 BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

10 "Management of lands and resources'', \$3,498,000;

11 BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

12 "Education and welfare services'', \$9,799,000;

13 "Resources management'', \$4,378,000;

14 "General administrative expenses'', \$500,000;

15 BUREAU OF OUTDOOR RECREATION

16 "Salaries and expenses'', \$200,000;

17 GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

18 "Surveys, investigations, and research'', \$3,310,000;

19 BUREAU OF MINES

20 "Conservation and development of mineral resources'',
 21 \$3,164,000;

22 "Health and safety'', \$1,120,000;

23 "General administrative expenses'', \$152,000;

24 OFFICE OF OIL AND GAS

25 "Salaries and expenses'', \$91,000;

BUREAU OF COMMERCIAL FISHERIES

“Management and investigations of resources”, \$936,000;

“Federal aid for commercial fisheries research and development”, \$13,000;

“Anadromous and Great Lakes fisheries conservation”, \$11,000;

“General administrative expenses”, \$131,000;

“Administration of Pribilof Islands”, \$120,000, to be derived from the Pribilof Islands fund;

“Limitation on administrative expenses, fisheries loan fund” (Increase of \$25,000 in the limitation on administrative expenses) ;

BUREAU OF SPORT FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE

“Management and investigations of resources”, \$3,363,000;

“General administrative expenses”, \$176,000;

“Anadromous and Great Lakes fisheries conservation”, \$17,000;

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

“Management and protection”, (44)\$3,359,000 \$3,681,000;

“Maintenance and rehabilitation of physical facilities”, \$1,346,000;

1 “General administrative expenses”, \$263,000;

2 “Preservation of historic properties”, \$40,000;

3 BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

4 “General investigations”, \$900,000;

5 “Operation and maintenance”, \$1,870,000;

6 “General administrative expenses”, \$970,000;

7 BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION

8 “Operation and maintenance”, \$800,000;

9 SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

10 “Operation and maintenance”, \$155,000;

11 OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR

12 “Salaries and expenses”, \$374,000;

13 OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

14 “Salaries and expenses”, \$702,000;

15 OFFICE OF WATER RESOURCES RESEARCH

16 “Salaries and expenses”, \$52,000;

17 DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

18 LEGAL ACTIVITIES AND GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

19 “Salaries and expenses, general administration”, \$634,-
20 000;

21 “Salaries and expenses, general legal activities”, \$2,-
22 264,000;

23 “Salaries and expenses, Antitrust Division”, \$769,000;

24 “Salaries and expenses, United States attorneys and
25 marshals”, \$3,824,000;

“Salaries and expenses, Community Relations Service”,
\$230,000;

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

“Salaries and expenses”, \$17,455,000;

IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE

“Salaries and expenses”, \$7,452,000;

FEDERAL PRISON SYSTEM

“Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Prisons”, \$5,109,000;

(45) *FEDERAL PRISON INDUSTRIES, INCORPORATED*

*LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE AND VOCATIONAL
TRAINING EXPENSES, FEDERAL PRISON INDUSTRIES,
INCORPORATED*

*In addition to the amount heretofore made available under
this heading for administrative expenses, \$55,000 shall be
available for such expenses during the current fiscal year.*

BUREAU OF NARCOTICS AND DANGEROUS DRUGS

“Salaries and expenses”, \$1,530,000;

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

MANPOWER ADMINISTRATION

“Manpower development and training activities”, \$145,-
000, of which \$100,000 shall be derived by transfer from
the appropriation for “Office of Manpower Administrator,
salaries and expenses”, fiscal year 1970;

“Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training, salaries and
expenses”, \$343,000;

1 “Bureau of Employment Security, salaries and ex-
 2 penses”, \$1,408,000, to be expended from the Employ-
 3 ment Security Administration account in the Unemploy-
 4 ment Trust Fund;

5 LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS

6 “Labor-Management Services Administration, salaries
 7 and expenses”, \$805,000;

8 WAGE AND LABOR STANDARDS

9 “Wage and Labor Standards Administration, salaries
 10 and expenses”, \$713,000;

11 “Wage and Hour Division, salaries and expenses”,
 12 \$1,440,000;

13 BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS

14 “Salaries and expenses”, \$1,693,000;

15 BUREAU OF INTERNATIONAL LABOR AFFAIRS

16 “Salaries and expenses”, \$130,000;

17 OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR

18 “Salaries and expenses”, \$438,000; and, in addition,
 19 \$13,000 to be derived from the Employment Security Ad-
 20 ministration account, Unemployment Trust Fund;

21 OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

22 “Salaries and expenses”, \$515,000; and, in addition,
 23 \$36,000 to be derived from the Employment Security Ad-
 24 ministration account, Unemployment Trust Fund;

OFFICE OF FEDERAL CONTRACT COMPLIANCE AND
CIVIL RIGHTS PROGRAM

“Salaries and expenses”, \$56,000; and, in addition,
\$53,000 to be derived from the Employment Security Administration account, Unemployment Trust Fund;

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

(OUT OF THE POSTAL FUND)

“Administration and regional operation”; \$10,715,000;

“Research, development, and engineering”, \$898,000;
to remain available until expended;

“Operations”, \$261,956,000;

“Supplies and services”, \$215,000;

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

ADMINISTRATION OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS

“Salaries and expenses,” \$13,400,000;

“Acquisition, operation, and maintenance of buildings
abroad,” \$177,000, to remain available until expended;

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND CONFERENCES

“Missions to international organizations,” \$340,000;

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSIONS

(46) INTERNATIONAL BOUNDARY AND WATER COMMISSION,
UNITED STATES AND MEXICO

*International Boundary and Water Commission, United
States and Mexico:*

1 (47)“Salaries and expenses,” \$81,000;

2 “Salaries and expenses,” \$81,000;

3 “Operation and maintenance,” \$175,000;

4 (48)“Operation and maintenance,” \$175,000;

5 “American sections, international commissions,” \$42,-
6 000;

7 “International fisheries commissions,” \$56,000;

8 EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE

9 “Mutual educational and cultural exchange activities,”
10 \$700,000;

11 OTHER

12 “Migration and refugee assistance,” \$60,000;

13 DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

14 OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

15 “Salaries and expenses”, \$720,000;

16 COAST GUARD

17 “Operating expenses”, \$21,675,000;

18 “Reserve training”, \$1,000,000;

19 FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION

20 “Operations”, \$58,597,000;

21 “Operation and maintenance, National Capital airports”,
22 \$400,000;

23 FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION

24 “Office of the Administrator, salaries and expenses”,
25 \$132,000 (together with an increase of \$941,000 in the

1 amount to be transferred from the appropriation for "Fed-
2 eral-aid Highways trust fund") ;

3 "Traffic and highway safety", \$600,000;

4 "Motor carrier safety", \$173,000;

5 "Bureau of Public Roads, limitation on general ex-
6 penses" (Increase of \$3,081,000 in the limitation on ad-
7 ministrative expenses to be paid from the appropriation for
8 the "Federal-aid highways trust fund") ;

9 FEDERAL RAILROAD ADMINISTRATION

10 "Office of the Administrator, salaries and expenses",
11 \$85,000;

12 "Bureau of Railroad Safety", \$270,000;

13 URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ADMINISTRATION

14 "Salaries and expenses", \$100,000;

15 SAINT LAWRENCE SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

16 "Limitation on administrative expenses" (Increase of
17 \$52,000 in the limitation on administrative expenses) ;

18 NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD

19 "Salaries and expenses", \$350,000;

20 TREASURY DEPARTMENT

21 OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

22 "Salaries and expenses", \$628,000;

23 BUREAU OF ACCOUNTS

24 "Salaries and expenses", \$400,000;

1 BUREAU OF CUSTOMS

2 "Salaries and expenses", \$8,830,000;

3 BUREAU OF THE MINT

4 "Salaries and expenses", \$500,000;

5 BUREAU OF THE PUBLIC DEBT

6 "Administering the public debt", \$1,444,000;

7 INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE

8 "Salaries and expenses", \$1,846,000;

9 "Revenue accounting and processing", \$11,920,000;

10 "Compliance", \$46,291,000;

11 OFFICE OF THE TREASURER

12 "Salaries and expenses", \$523,000;

13 UNITED STATES SECRET SERVICE

14 "Salaries and expenses", (49)\$1,740,000 \$1,940,-

15 000(50): *Provided, That \$200,000 of this appropriation*16 *shall be available only upon enactment into law of S. 2694,*17 *Ninety-first Congress, or similar legislation;*

18 ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

19 "Operating expenses", \$5,000,000;

20 GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

21 "Operating expenses, Public Buildings Service",

22 \$7,222,000;

23 "Operating expenses, Federal Supply Service",

24 \$4,431,000;

1 “Operating expenses, National Archives and Records
2 Service”, \$1,635,000;

3 “Operating expenses, Transportation and Communica-
4 tions Service”, \$528,000;

5 “Operating expenses, Property Management and Dis-
6 posal Service”, \$796,000;

7 “Salaries and expenses, Office of Administrator”,
8 \$71,000;

9 NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE

10 ADMINISTRATION

11 “Research and program management”, \$38,000,000;

12 VETERANS ADMINISTRATION

13 “Medical and prosthetic research”, \$2,983,000;

14 “Medical administration and miscellaneous operating
15 expenses”, \$955,000;

16 “General operating expenses”, \$15,835,000;

17 OTHER INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

18 AMERICAN BATTLE MONUMENTS COMMISSION

19 “Salaries and expenses”, \$77,000;

20 CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

21 “Salaries and expenses”, \$900,000;

22 CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

23 “Salaries and expenses”, \$2,354,000;

1 EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION

2 "Salaries and expenses", \$900,000;

3 EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF THE UNITED STATES

4 "Limitation on administrative expenses" (Increase of
5 \$400,000 in the limitation on administrative expenses) ;

6 FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

7 "Limitation on administrative expenses" (Increase of
8 \$215,000 in the limitation on administrative expenses) ;

9 FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

10 "Salaries and expenses", \$1,700,000;

11 FEDERAL FIELD COMMITTEE FOR DEVELOPMENT

12 PLANNING IN ALASKA

13 "Salaries and expenses", \$21,000;

14 FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

15 "Limitation on administrative and nonadministrative ex-
16 penses, Federal Home Loan Bank Board" (Increase of
17 \$412,000 in the limitation on administrative expenses, and
18 increase of \$325,000 in the limitation on nonadministrative
19 expenses) ;

20 "Limitation on administrative expenses, Federal Savings
21 and Loan Insurance Corporation" (Increase of \$24,000 in
22 the limitation on administrative expenses) ;

23 FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION

24 "Salaries and expenses", \$228,000;

FEDERAL MEDIATION AND CONCILIATION SERVICE

“Salaries and expenses”, \$615,000;

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

“Salaries and expenses”, \$1,300,000;

FEDERAL RADIATION COUNCIL

“Salaries and expenses”, \$8,000;

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

“Salaries and expenses”, \$1,000,000;

FOREIGN CLAIMS SETTLEMENT COMMISSION

“Salaries and expenses”, \$56,000;

HISTORICAL AND MEMORIAL COMMISSIONS

American Revolution Bicentennial Commission:

“Salaries and expenses”, \$10,000;

INTER-AGENCY COMMITTEE ON MEXICAN-AMERICAN
AFFAIRS

“Salaries and expenses”, \$27,000;

INTERGOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES

ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL

RELATIONS

“Salaries and expenses”, \$45,000;

(51) APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION

“Salaries and expenses”, \$42,000, to be derived by
transfer from the appropriation for “Appalachian regional
development programs”;

1 INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

2 "Salaries and expenses", \$1,900,000;

3 NATIONAL CAPITAL PLANNING COMMISSION

4 "Salaries and expenses", \$25,000;

5 NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE
6 HUMANITIES

7 "Salaries and expenses", \$120,000;

8 NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

9 "Salaries and expenses", \$1,642,000;

10 NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

11 "Salaries and expenses", \$127,000;

12 PRESIDENT'S COMMITTEE ON CONSUMER INTERESTS

13 "Salaries and expenses", \$10,000;

14 RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

15 "Limitation on salaries and expenses" (Increase of
16 \$990,000 in the limitation on "Salaries and expenses");

17 RENEGOTIATION BOARD

18 "Salaries and expenses", \$110,000;

19 SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

20 "Salaries and expenses", \$1,000,000;

21 SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

22 "Salaries and expenses", \$3,971,000, of which \$3,163,-
23 000 shall be derived by transfer from the "Business loan and
24 investment fund", from the "Disaster loan fund", and from
25 the "Lease guarantees revolving fund";

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

“Salaries and expenses”, \$1,331,000;

“Salaries and expenses, National Gallery of Art,”
\$191,000;

SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL BOARD

Salaries and expenses”, \$57,000;

TARIFF COMMISSION

“Salaries and expenses”, \$239,000;

TAX COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

“Salaries and expenses”, \$140,000;

UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY

“Salaries and expenses”, \$6,883,000;

“Special international exhibitions”, \$183,000 to remain
available until expended;

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

(OUT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FUNDS)

“General operating expenses”, ~~(52)\$1,932,000~~ \$2,229,-
000;

“Public safety”, ~~(53)\$1,780,000~~ \$2,324,000;

“Education”, \$966,000;

“Parks and recreation”, ~~(54)\$652,000~~ \$899,000;

“Health and welfare”, ~~(55)\$4,478,000~~ \$4,624,000;

“Highways and traffic”, \$600,000;

“Sanitary engineering”, ~~(56)\$1,096,000~~ \$1,905,000.

DIVISION OF EXPENSES

The sums appropriated in this title for the District of Columbia shall be paid as follows: (57) ~~\$10,332,000~~ \$12,191,000 from the general fund; (58) ~~\$533,000~~ \$535,000 from the highway fund (regular); \$14,000 from the highway fund (parking); (59) ~~\$375,000~~ \$468,000 from the water fund; and (60) ~~\$250,000~~ \$339,000 from the sanitary sewage works fund.

TITLE III

INCREASED PAY COSTS—FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

SALARY ACT OF 1970

SEC. 301. For costs in the fiscal year 1970 of pay increases granted by or pursuant to the Federal Employees Salary Act of 1970 and the Act of December 16, 1967 (81 Stat. 649), for any branch of the Federal Government or the municipal government of the District of Columbia, to be available immediately, such amounts as may be necessary, to be determined as hereinafter provided in this title, but no appropriation, fund, limitation, or authorization may be increased pursuant to the provisions of this title in an amount in excess of the cost to such appropriation, fund, limitation, or authorization of increased compensation pursuant to such statutes.

SEC. 302. Any officer having administrative control of an appropriation, fund, limitation, or authorization properly

1 chargeable with the costs in the fiscal year 1970 of pay
2 increases granted by or pursuant to the Federal Employees
3 Salary Act of 1970 and the Act of December 16, 1967 (81
4 Stat. 649), is authorized to transfer thereto, from the un-
5 obligated balance of any other appropriation, fund, or au-
6 thorization under his administrative control and expiring for
7 obligation on June 30, 1970, such amounts as may be neces-
8 sary for meeting such costs.

9 SEC. 303. Whenever any officer referred to in section 304
10 of this title shall determine that he has exhausted the possi-
11 bilities of meeting the cost of pay increases through the use
12 of transfers as authorized by said section, he shall certify the
13 additional amount required to meet such costs for each ap-
14 propriation, fund, limitation, or authorization under his ad-
15 ministrative control, and the amounts so certified shall be
16 added to the pertinent appropriation, fund, limitation, or
17 authorization for the fiscal year 1970: *Provided*, That any
18 transfer under the authority of section 302 or any certification
19 made under the authority of this section by an officer in or
20 under the executive branch of the Federal Government shall
21 be valid only when approved by the Director of the Bureau
22 of the Budget.

23 SEC. 304. For the purposes of the transfers and certifi-
24 cations authorized by sections 302 and 303 of this title, the
25 following officers shall be deemed to have administrative con-

1 trol of appropriations, funds, limitations, or authorizations
2 available within their respective organization units—

3 (a) For the legislative branch:

4 The Clerk of the House;

5 The Secretary of the Senate;

6 The Librarian of Congress;

7 The Architect of the Capitol;

8 The Public Printer;

9 The Comptroller General of the United States;

10 The Chief Judge of the United States Tax Court;

11 The chairman of any commission in or under the

12 legislative branch.

13 (b) For the Judiciary:

14 The Administrative Officer of the United States
15 Courts.

16 (c) For the executive branch:

17 The head of each department, agency, or cor-
18 poration in or under the executive branch.

19 (d) For the municipal government of the District of
20 Columbia:

21 The Commissioner of the District of Columbia.

22 SEC. 305. Obligations or expenditures incurred for costs
23 in the fiscal year 1970 of pay increases granted by or pur-
24 suant to the Federal Employees Salary Act of 1970 and the
25 Act of December 16, 1967 (81 Stat. 649), shall not be

1 regarded or reported as violations of section 3679 of the
2 Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665).

3 SEC. 306. (a) Amounts made available by this title
4 shall be derived from the same source as the appropriation,
5 fund, limitation, or authorization to which such amounts
6 are added.

7 (b) Appropriations made by, and transfers made pur-
8 suant to, this title shall be recorded on the books of the
9 Government as of June 30, 1970: *Provided*, That no ap-
10 propriation made by this title shall be warranted, and no
11 transfer authorized by this title shall be made, after Au-
12 gust 15, 1970.

13 (c) A complete report of the appropriations and trans-
14 fers made by or pursuant to this title shall be made, not later
15 than September 15, 1970, by the officers described in section
16 304, to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, who shall
17 compile and transmit to the Congress a consolidated report
18 not later than October 15, 1970.

19 TITLE IV

20 LIMITATION ON FISCAL YEAR 1970 BUDGET

21 OUTLAYS

22 SEC. 401. (a) Notwithstanding the provisions of title
23 IV of the Second Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1969,
24 expenditures and net lending (budget outlays) of the Fed-
25 eral Government during the fiscal year ending June 30,

1 1970, shall not exceed \$197,885,000,000: *Provided*, That
2 whenever action, or inaction, by the Congress on requests for
3 appropriations and other budgetary proposals varies from
4 the President's recommendations with respect to the fiscal
5 year 1970, as reflected in the Budget for 1971 (H. Doc.
6 91-240, part 1), the Director of the Bureau of the Budget
7 shall report to the President and to the Congress his estimate
8 of the effect of such action or inaction on budget outlays, and
9 the limitation set forth herein shall be correspondingly ad-
10 justed: *Provided further*, That the Director of the Bureau of
11 the Budget shall report to the President and to the Congress
12 his estimate of the effect on budget outlays of other actions
13 by the Congress (whether initiated by the President or the
14 Congress) and the limitation set forth herein shall be corre-
15 spondingly adjusted: *Provided further*, That in the event the
16 President shall estimate and determine that total budget out-
17 lays cannot be held within the overall limitation provided
18 herein, he may, after notification in writing to the Congress
19 stating his reasons therefor, adjust the amount by not more
20 than one-half of 1 percent thereof.

21 (b) (1) In the event the President shall estimate and
22 determine that budget outlays during the fiscal year 1970 for
23 the following items (the expenditures for which arise under
24 appropriations or other authority not requiring annual action

1 by the Congress) appearing on page 49 of the Budget for
2 1971, namely:

3 (i) items designated "Social security, medicare,
4 and other social insurance trust funds";

5 (ii) the item "National service life insurance (trust
6 fund)";

7 (iii) the item "Interest"; and

8 (iv) the item "Farm price supports (Commodity
9 Credit Corporation)";

10 will exceed the estimates included for such items in the
11 Budget for 1971, the President may, after notification in
12 writing to the Congress stating his reasons therefor, adjust
13 accordingly the amount of the overall limitation provided
14 in subsection (a).

15 (2) In the event the President shall estimate and deter-
16 mine that receipts (credited against budget outlays) during
17 the fiscal year 1970 derived from:

18 (i) sales of financial assets of programs administered
19 by the Farmers Home Administration, Export-Import
20 Bank, agencies of the Department of Housing and Urban
21 Development, and the Veterans' Administration; and

22 (ii) leases of lands on the Outer Continental Shelf;

23 will be less than the estimates included for such items in the
24 Budget for 1971, the President may, after notification in

1 writing to the Congress stating his reasons therefor, adjust
2 accordingly the amount of the overall limitation provided
3 in subsection (a).

4 (3) The aggregate amount of the adjustments made
5 pursuant to paragraphs (1) and (2) of this subsection shall
6 not exceed \$1,000,000,000.

7 (c) The Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall
8 make a preliminary report (by July 31, 1970) and a final
9 report (by December 31, 1970) to the President and the
10 Congress on the operation of this section.

11 TITLE V

12 LIMITATION ON FISCAL YEAR 1971 BUDGET

13 OUTLAYS

14 SEC. 501. (a) Expenditures and net lending (budget
15 outlays) of the Federal Government during the fiscal year
16 ending June 30, 1971, shall not exceed \$200,771,000,000:
17 *Provided*, That whenever action, or inaction, by the Con-
18 gress on requests for appropriations and other budgetary pro-
19 posals varies from the President's recommendations reflected
20 in the Budget for 1971 (H. Doc. 91-240, part 1), the Di-
21 rector of the Bureau of the Budget shall report to the Presi-
22 dent and to the Congress his estimate of the effect of such
23 action or inaction on budget outlays, and the limitation set
24 forth herein shall be correspondingly adjusted: *Provided*
25 *further*, That the Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall

1 report to the President and to the Congress his estimate of
2 the effect on budget outlays of other actions by the Congress
3 (whether initiated by the President or the Congress) and
4 the limitation set forth herein shall be correspondingly ad-
5 justed, and reports, so far as practicable, shall indicate
6 whether such other actions were initiated by the President
7 or by the Congress.

8 (b) (1) In the event the President shall estimate and
9 determine that budget outlays during the fiscal year 1971
10 for the following items (the expenditures for which arise
11 under appropriations or other authority not requiring an-
12 nual action by the Congress) appearing on page 49 of the
13 Budget for 1971, namely:

14 (i) items designated "Social security, medicare, and
15 other social insurance trust funds";

16 (ii) the item "National service life insurance
17 (trust fund)";

18 (iii) the item "Interest"; and

19 (iv) the item "Farm price supports (Commodity
20 Credit Corporation) "

21 will exceed the estimates included for such items in the
22 Budget for 1971, the President may, after notification in
23 writing to the Congress stating his reasons therefor, adjust
24 accordingly the amount of the overall limitation provided in
25 subsection (a).

1 (2) In the event the President shall estimate and deter-
2 mine that receipts (credited against budget outlays) during
3 the fiscal year 1971 derived from:

4 (i) sales of financial assets of programs adminis-
5 tered by the Farmers Home Administration, Export-
6 Import Bank, agencies of the Department of Housing
7 and Urban Development, and the Veterans' Adminis-
8 tration; and

9 (ii) leases of lands on the Outer Continental
10 Shelf;

11 will be less than the estimates included for such items in
12 the Budget for 1971, the President may, after notification
13 in writing to the Congress stating his reasons therefor, adjust
14 accordingly the amount of the overall limitation provided
15 in subsection (a).

16 (3) The aggregate amount of the adjustments made
17 pursuant to paragraphs (1) and (2) of this subsection shall
18 not exceed ~~(61)\$3,000,000,000.~~ \$6,000,000,000.

19 (c) The Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall re-
20 port periodically to the President and to the Congress on the
21 operation of this section. Such reports shall be made at the
22 end of each calendar month during the second session of the
23 Ninety-first Congress and at the end of each calendar quar-
24 ter thereafter.

TITLE VI

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 601. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year unless expressly so provided therein.

SEC. 602. Except where specifically increased or decreased elsewhere in this Act, the restrictions contained within appropriations, or provisions affecting appropriations or other funds, available during the fiscal year 1970, limiting the amounts which may be expended for personal services, or for purposes involving personal services, or amounts which may be transferred between appropriations or authorizations available for or involving such services, are hereby increased to the extent necessary to meet increased pay costs authorized by or pursuant to law.

SEC. 603. None of the funds contained in this Act available to the Inter-American Bank shall be used directly or indirectly as grants or loans to officers or members of the staff of the Inter-American Bank.

(62) SEC. 604. *Funds appropriated, or otherwise made available, by this Act for the fiscal year 1970, shall remain available for obligation until July 1, 1970, or for five days after the date of approval of this Act, whichever is later, unless a longer period is specifically provided: Provided,*

1 *That all obligations incurred in anticipation of such appro-*
2 *priations and authority for the fiscal year 1970 as well*
3 *as those for longer periods as set forth herein are hereby*
4 *ratified and confirmed if in accordance with the terms hereof.*

Passed the House of Representatives May 7, 1970.

Attest:

W. PAT JENNINGS,

Clerk.

Passed the Senate with amendments June 22, 1970.

Attest:

FRANCIS R. VALEO,

Secretary.

AN ACT

Making supplemental appropriations for the
fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for
other purposes.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JUNE 22, 1970

Ordered to be printed with the amendments of the
Senate numbered

April 10, I believe, ready for action. It was in the form of a concurrent resolution.

The original Gulf of Tonkin resolution, by its terms, stated that it may be repealed by a concurrent resolution. That is the form which the resolution we reported is in. That is the orderly way to do it. It is the Mathias resolution. It seems to me that this is a disorderly way. The fate of the bill before us is uncertain because it is not a concurrent resolution as Senators know, which does not have to go to the White House. It may or may not be accepted, but it may or may not be accepted in the House because of other issues; specifically, the matter of the Church-Cooper amendment. The Senator knows how controversial that has been. It has been filibustered here for 6 weeks. Thus, the purpose is procedural. I favor, of course, repeal of the Gulf of Tonkin resolution. I voted for the one reported by the committee. It is in a form which I think is the proper form and the right way to do it.

Mr. HANSEN. I thank the distinguished Senator from Arkansas.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote! Vote!

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, let me say to the Senate that I hope they are under no illusions, because I have got a speech to make on the substance. We have to vote on supporting repeal. I am not going to yield for a vote right now.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President—

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GURNEY). The Senator from Montana is recognized.

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION, 1970

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I can recognize a delay, a stall, a filibuster. It

is my purpose, inasmuch as we are not going to be allowed to vote now—and that is unfortunate—to ask that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 918, H.R. 17399, the second supplemental appropriation bill, 1970, and that it be laid down and made the pending business for this evening.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President—

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending business be laid aside temporarily, only for tonight, and that the Senate proceed to the bill I have just designated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—what is that bill?

Mr. MANSFIELD. It is the second supplemental appropriation bill for 1970.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, my understanding is that under the unanimous consent already given, the majority leader is within his right now to put the Senate into the matter of the consideration of one of the appropriation bills, the time now being past 5 o'clock.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GURNEY). Without objection, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the bill, which the clerk will state.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. Calendar No. 918, H.R. 17399, making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, before we start on the temporary pending business—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GURNEY). The Senator from Montana will suspend. The Senate will come to order so that the majority leader may be heard.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I believe that the distinguished Senator from New Mexico (Mr. ANDERSON) has a conference report.

NASA AUTHORIZATION BILL— CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 16516) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and research and program management, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GURNEY). The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The assistant legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of June 15, 1970, pp. H5490-H5492, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a comparative tabulation showing the amounts requested by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the House action, the Senate action and the conference action.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUMMARY OF ACTION OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 16516 NASA AUTHORIZATION FOR FISCAL YEAR 1971

(In thousands of dollars)

	Budget request	House action	Senate action	Conference action		Budget request	House action	Senate action	Conference action
Research and development:					Construction of facilities:				
Apollo.....	956,500	1,087,000	956,500	994,500	Ames Research Center.....	1,525	1,525	1,525	1,525
Space flight operations.....	515,200	654,700	515,200	565,200	Goddard Space Flight Center.....	2,050	2,050	0	1,928
Advanced missions.....	2,500	1,000	2,500	1,500	Jet Propulsion Laboratory.....	1,950	1,950	1,950	1,950
Physics and astronomy.....	116,000	110,400	116,000	116,000	John F. Kennedy Space Center.....	575	575	575	575
Lunar and planetary exploration.....	144,900	144,900	144,900	144,900	Manned Spacecraft Center.....	900	900	900	900
Bioscience.....	12,900	12,900	12,900	12,900	Marshall Space Flight Center.....	525	525	525	525
Space applications.....	167,000	172,600	167,000	167,000	Nuclear Rocket Development Station.....	3,500	3,500	3,500	3,500
Launch vehicle procurement.....	124,900	124,900	124,900	124,900	Various locations.....	18,575	17,950	18,575	18,575
Space vehicle systems.....	30,000	30,000	30,000	30,000	Facility planning and design.....	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000
Electronics systems.....	22,400	23,900	22,400	23,900	Total.....	34,600	33,975	32,550	34,478
Human factor systems.....	17,900	18,300	17,900	18,300	Research and program management.....	692,300	693,700	677,300	683,300
Basic research.....	17,600	18,000	17,600	18,000	Grand total.....	3,333,000	3,600,875	3,315,950	3,410,878
Space power and electric propulsion systems.....	30,900	30,900	30,900	30,900					
Nuclear rockets.....	38,000	38,000	38,000	38,000					
Chemical propulsion.....	20,300	20,300	20,300	20,300					
Aeronautical vehicles.....	87,100	87,100	87,010	87,100					
Tracking and data acquisition.....	298,000	293,800	298,000	295,200					
Technology utilization.....	4,000	4,500	4,000	4,500					
Total.....	2,606,100	2,873,200	2,606,100	2,693,100					

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, the total authorization request for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for fiscal year 1971 was \$3,333,000,000. The House approved a total authorization of \$3,600,875,000. The Senate in its action on the authorization bill amended H.R. 16516, approving a

total of \$3,315,950,000, an amount \$284,925,000 less than provided by the House bill. The conferees are recommending a total authorization of \$3,410,878,000. This amount is \$77,878,000 above the NASA request, \$189,997,000 below the House bill and \$94,928,000 above the amount approved by the Senate.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Mr. President, in adjusting the difference between the Senate and House-passed versions of H.R. 16516, the conferees agreed as follows:

For Research and Development the House had authorized a total of \$2,873,200,000 for 18 programs. The Senate had

authorized \$2,606,100,000 for the same programs, or \$267,100,000 less than the House. The conferees agreed to a total of \$2,693,100,000 which is \$180,100,000 less than provided by the House bill and \$87,000,000 more than provided by the Senate.

In reaching this amount for research and development, the conferees agreed to an authorization of \$994,500,000 for the Apollo program, which is \$92,500,000 less than the amount authorized by the House and \$38,000,000 more than the amount authorized by the Senate. This \$38,000,000 addition would be for the production of long leadtime items for scientific payloads for Apollo lunar exploration flight after 1972.

The conferees agreed to an authorization of \$565,200,000 for the space flight operations program, which is \$89,500,000 less than the amount provided by the House and \$50,000,000 more than the amount provided by the Senate. The additional \$50,000,000 would be applied to the Apollo applications—recently designated "Skylab"—project, now in the hardware phase, to augment the development and qualification effort on spacecraft and workshop subsystems.

For advanced missions the House had authorized \$1,000,000 and the Senate \$2,500,000. The conferees agreed to the amount of \$1,500,000.

Small offsetting adjustments were made in some of the other research and development programs which did not involve any changes in the total funding by the House or Senate.

CONSTRUCTION OF FACILITIES

For construction of facilities the House provided a total of \$33,975,000 and the Senate authorized a total of \$32,550,000. The principal difference was a \$2,050,000 item for an earth resources technology laboratory at the Goddard Space Flight Center which had been cut out by the Senate. While the Senate approved of the earth resources program it was felt that the administration had not done sufficient long-range planning for an operational earth resources survey satellite system which would be utilized by many of the departments and agencies of the Government. The Senate agreed to restore \$1,928,000, which is the current estimated cost of this laboratory resulting from design changes by NASA subsequent to its original budget presentation, in order that the experimental portion of the program can be continued, but the conferees agreed that strong language would be placed in the statement of managers indicating that both Houses believe that the administration should initiate immediately long-range planning examining the management, technical, and other aspects of an operational program. The conferees further agreed that operational facilities should not be built until the benefits of surveys can be assessed and determinations made that an operational system should be built. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the language agreed to be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the language was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LANGUAGE ON GODDARD FACILITY

It is clear that several federal agencies will have a need for the kind of information that will be provided by earth resources satellites. In fact, NASA is designing the data collection and return systems of the Earth Resources Technology Satellites (ERTS) so as to maximize their usefulness for the prospective user agencies. It is equally clear, however, that insufficient attention has been given to the organizational aspects of an operational system which are compounded by the very nature of the multiple interests that would be served. In addition, there are international ramifications to an operating ERTS system that have not been adequately considered.

The Conferees agree, therefore, that the Executive Branch and particularly NASA and the Office of Management and Budget should give prompt and careful study to the problem of how an operational earth resources survey satellite system would be structured both in terms of the many federal agency interests that will be involved and in terms of its international aspects. However, in view of the current developmental status of the NASA experimental project, operational facilities for an earth resources survey satellite system should not be built until such time that the benefits of continuing satellite surveys can be assessed and a determination made that an operational earth resources satellite system should be built.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, in addition, the House had authorized a total of \$17,950,000 for various locations and the Senate had authorized \$18,575,000, or an amount \$625,000 above the House authorization. This amount was to be used for preservative-type rehabilitation work at the Michoud assembly facility and at the Mississippi test facility. The House receded from its disagreement to the Senate figure and agreed to the additional \$625,000.

RESEARCH AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT

For research and program management, the House had authorized a total of \$693,700,000 and the Senate had authorized \$677,300,000, which was \$16,400,000 less than the House authorization. In addition, the Senate specified that a ceiling of not to exceed \$500,108,000 of such authorization be available for personnel and related costs. The Senate further provided that NASA authority to transfer funds should not be construed to authorize the expenditure of amounts for personnel and related costs in excess of the ceiling established by the Senate for such costs.

In conference a total of \$683,300,000 was agreed to for research and program management of which not more than \$506,108,000 shall be used for personnel and related costs. This represents a \$9 million reduction in personnel costs from the NASA budget request. The conferees agreed to the ceiling on personnel costs passed by the Senate with a proviso that the funding for personnel costs might be increased 1 percent in the event the Administrator determines such an increase is necessary for the safety of any mission.

The House in its bill had added \$1.4 million to the research and program management budget stipulating that the increase was for research fellowships, additional summer jobs, and graduate and undergraduate fellowships in the field of aeronautics. The Senate amendment to the House bill contained no such pro-

vision. The conferees agreed that there is an urgent need for encouraging young people trained in the aeronautical sciences to accept research positions in NASA so as to help maintain a position of leadership for the United States in the field of aeronautics. Therefore, the conferees agreed that NASA should initiate, within the amount authorized for research and program management, an educational program directed to the aeronautical sciences.

OTHER LEGISLATIVE AMENDMENTS

The Senate bill included two other legislative changes which were not in the House-passed bill. One provision would place a ceiling of \$600,000 on appropriated funds to be used by NASA for the payment of services, per diem, travel, and other expenses of experts and consultants. The House conferees agreed to this amendment. The Senate bill also included a legislative amendment to section 6 of the House Authorization Act, 1970, which would make certain minor and generally nonsubstantive changes in that section so that NASA and DOD can issue uniform regulations relative to the submission of certain specified data relating to employees and former employees of both NASA and the DOD. The House conferees agreed to this amendment.

Mr. President, there was a good deal of give and take in the conference committee which brought the House and Senate into agreement on this bill, H.R. 16516. I would like to congratulate all of the conferees—both the House and the Senate—for their fine participation. However, I think no one deserves more credit for the report I am presenting to the Senate today than the senior Senator from Maine (Mrs. SMITH). As usual, she was there for every minute of the conference, was thoroughly prepared and supported the Senate's position with determination and vigor. It is a pleasure to have served on the conference committee with her.

Mr. President, I move adoption of the conference report.

The motion was agreed to.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Chamber be cleared of all unauthorized personnel.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GURNEY). The Sergeant at Arms will clear the Chamber of all unauthorized personnel.

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1970

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 17399) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I would like to know now that we have laid new business before the Senate whether the Pastore rule of germaneness for 3 hours obtains.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair announces that the 3 hours for germaneness has elapsed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, may I express the hope to the Senate, on behalf of the joint leadership, that at least an informal adherence to the Pastore rule of germaneness might be applicable on the second measure we are considering today so that we might get on to the business at hand.

We have a morning hour which will allow the inclusion of morning business at any time during the course of the day. But in the interest of expediting our labors today, we might give consideration to the request of the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on Friday I made an opening statement on the second supplemental appropriations bill for 1970. The statement is in the RECORD. I have no further comments to make at this point.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be considered and agreed to en bloc, and that the bill as thus amended be regarded as original text for the purpose of amendment, provided that no point of order shall be considered to have been waived by reason thereof.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The amendments agreed to en bloc are as follows:

On page 2, line 10, after the word "exceed", strike out "\$597,000" and insert "\$425,000".

On page 2, after line 21, insert:

"FEDERAL PAYMENT TO DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

"For an additional amount for 'Federal payment to the District of Columbia', to be paid to the general fund of the District of Columbia, \$4,042,000."

On page 3, line 10, after the word "expenses", strike out "\$2,675" and insert "\$174,675".

On page 3, line 16, after the word "vehicle", strike out "\$2,370,500" and insert "\$3,966,485".

On page 3, line 22, strike out "\$47,300" and insert "\$171,750".

On page 3, after line 22, insert:

"SETTLEMENT OF CLAIMS AND SUITS

"For payment of property damage claims in excess of \$500 and of personal injury claims in excess of \$1,000, approved by the Commission in accordance with the provisions of the Act of February 11, 1929, as amended (45 Stat. 1160; 46 Stat. 500; 65 Stat. 131), \$20,000, payable from the general fund."

On page 4, line 7, after the word "expended", strike out "\$1,658,000" and insert "\$8,768,000"; and, after the amendment just above stated, insert a colon and "Provided, That \$374,500 shall be available for construction services by the Director of General Services or by contract for architectural engineering services, as may be determined by the Commissioner."

On page 4, after line 18, insert:

"FOREIGN ASSISTANCE

"FOREIGN MILITARY CREDIT SALES

"For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary to enable the President to carry out the provisions of the Foreign Military Sales Act, as amended, \$250,000,000: *Provided*, That this paragraph shall be effective only upon the enactment into law of H.R. 15628,

Ninety-first Congress, or similar legislation: *Provided further*, That such funds shall remain available until thirty days after the date of approval of this Act, or of H.R. 15628, Ninety-first Congress, or similar legislation, whichever is later."

On page 5, after line 19, insert:

"PAYMENT TO CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY FUND

"For an additional amount for 'Payment to civil service retirement and disability fund', as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 8348, \$157,816,600, to be credited to the civil service retirement and disability fund."

On page 6, after line 7, insert:

"GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

"REAL PROPERTY ACTIVITIES

"SITE AND EXPENSES, PUBLIC BUILDING PROJECTS

"For an additional amount for 'Sites and expenses, public buildings projects', \$371,000, to remain available until expended."

On page 6, line 17, strike out "\$7,000,000" and insert "\$7,433,000".

On page 7, after line 4, strike out:

"COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

"SALARIES AND EXPENSES

"For expenses necessary for the Council on Environmental Quality in carrying out its functions under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (Public Law 91190), including hire of passenger motor vehicles and partial support of the cabinet committee on environmental quality, and the Citizens' Advisory Committee on Environment Quality established by Executive Order 11472 of May 29, 1969, or any amendatory order, \$100,000."

And, in lieu thereof, insert:

"COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY AND OFFICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

"SALARIES AND EXPENSES

"For expenses necessary for the Council on Environmental Quality and the Office of Environmental Quality, in carrying out their functions under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (Public Law 91-190) and the Environmental Quality Improvement Act of 1970 (Public Law 91-224), including hire of passenger vehicles, and partial support of the Cabinet Committee on the Environment and the Citizen's Advisory Committee on Environmental Quality, established by Executive Order 11472 of May 29, 1969, as amended by Executive Order 11514 of March 5, 1970, \$200,000."

On page 10, after line 12, insert:

"GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

"SURVEYS, INVESTIGATIONS, AND RESEARCH

"For an additional amount for 'Surveys, investigations, and research', \$225,000."

On page 10, line 20, after the word "Protection", strike out "\$850,000" and insert "\$775,000".

On page 11, line 6, after the word "management", strike out "\$21,000,000" and insert "\$21,172,000"; and, after the amendment just above stated, insert a comma and "including \$172,000 to remain available until expended."

On page 12, after line 2, insert:

"MANPOWER ADMINISTRATION

"MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING ACTIVITIES

"For an additional amount for manpower and development training activities, to carry out the provisions of section 102 of the Manpower Development Training Act of 1962, as amended, \$50,000,000 to remain available until September 30, 1970: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall not be available for the purposes of sections 106(d) and 309(b) of said Act."

On page 12, after line 16, insert:

"TRADE ADJUSTMENT ACTIVITIES

"For an additional amount for 'Trade Adjustment Activities', \$2,330,000, together with such amount as may be necessary to be

charged to the subsequent year appropriation for these expenses for any period subsequent to March 31 of the current year."

On page 14, after line 2, insert:

"HOSPITAL MODERNIZATION AND CONSTRUCTION

"For an additional amount for grants or loans for hospitals and related facilities pursuant to section 601(b) of the Public Health Service Act, \$8,703,078."

On page 14, after line 6, insert:

"OFFICE OF EDUCATION

"EMERGENCY SCHOOL ASSISTANCE

"For providing emergency assistance to desegregating school districts under part D of the Education Professions Development Act (title V of the Higher Education Act of 1965), the Cooperative Research Act, title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, section 807 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, section 402 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1967, and title II of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, as amended, including necessary administrative expenses therefor, \$150,000,000 to remain available until September 30, 1970: *Provided*, That no part of any funds appropriated herein to carry out programs under title II of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 shall be included as part of the amounts appropriated for the purpose of determining allocations for each purpose set forth in clauses (1) through (8) of section 102(b) of the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1969: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated for administrative expenses shall remain available until June 30, 1971."

On page 15, after line 13, insert:

"SENATE

"CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE SENATE

"INQUIRIES AND INVESTIGATIONS

"For an additional amount for 'Inquiries and Investigations', fiscal year 1970, \$345,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation, 'Salaries, Officers and Employees', fiscal year 1970."

On page 17, after line 7, insert:

"LEGAL ACTIVITIES AND GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

"FEES AND EXPENSES OF WITNESSES

"For an additional amount for 'Fees and expenses of witnesses', \$500,000."

On page 17, after line 15, insert:

"FEDERAL PRISON SYSTEM

"Support of United States Prisoners

For an additional amount for 'Support of United States prisoners', \$850,000."

On page 18, after line 4, insert:

"MARITIME ADMINISTRATION

"STATE MARINE SCHOOLS

"For an additional amount for 'State Marine Schools', for maintenance and repair of vessels loaned by the United States for use in connection with such State marine schools, \$145,000."

On page 19, after line 10, insert:

"DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE

On page 19, line 22, after the word "pay", strike out "\$1,250,000" and insert "\$1,000,000".

On page 20, after line 12, insert:

"BUREAU OF ACCOUNTS

"SALARIES AND EXPENSES

"For an additional amount for, 'Salaries and expenses', \$1,300,000."

On page 20, line 20, after the word "debt", strike out "\$3,250,000" and insert "\$3,600,000".

On page 20, line 24, after the word "Transportation", strike out "\$10,700,000" and insert "\$10,600,000".

On page 21, line 5, strike out "\$83,000" and insert "\$67,000".

On page 21, line 13, after the word "Congress", insert a comma and "and Senate Document numbered 91-86 Ninety-first Congress"; and, in line 14, after the amendment

just above stated, strike out "\$6,591,406" and insert "\$23,478,461".

On page 22, after line 6, insert:

"SENATE

"Compensation of the Vice President and Senators", \$10,835;

"Salaries, officers and employees", \$3,634,-674;

"Office of the Legislative Counsel of the Senate", \$39,120;

"Contingent expenses of the Senate:

"Senate policy committees", \$47,120;

"Automobiles and maintenance", \$4,140;

"Inquiries and investigations", \$662,515; including \$23,695 for the Committee on Appropriations;

"Folding documents", \$4,660;

"Miscellaneous items", \$92,810;

On page 24, line 5, after the word "Committee", strike out "\$44,490" and insert "\$43,475".

On page 24, after line 20, insert: "Senate office buildings", \$146,300;"

On page 24, after line 21, insert: "Senate garage", \$3,400;"

On page 32, line 10, after the word "Force", strike out "\$485,000,000" and insert "\$502,500,000".

On page 32, line 20, after the word "Army", strike out "\$196,480,000" and insert "\$206,900,000".

On page 32, line 22, after the word "Navy", strike out "\$157,800,000" and insert "\$166,100,000".

On page 33, line 1, after the word "agencies", strike out "\$70,400,000" and insert "\$74,200,000".

On page 33, line 4, strike out "\$43,800,000" and insert "\$14,800,000".

On page 43, after line 6, insert:

"FEDERAL PRISON INDUSTRIES, INCORPORATED
"LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE AND VOCATIONAL TRAINING EXPENSES, FEDERAL PRISON INDUSTRIES, INCORPORATED

"In addition to the amount heretofore made available under this heading for administrative expenses, \$55,000 shall be available for such expenses during the current fiscal year."

On page 46, after line 1, strike out:

"INTERNATIONAL BOUNDARY AND WATER COMMISSION, UNITED STATES AND MEXICO."

And, in lieu thereof, insert:

"International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico:"

On page 46, after line 5, strike out: "Salaries and expenses," \$81,000;"

And, in lieu thereof, insert: "Salaries and expenses," \$81,000;"

On page 46, after line 7, strike out:

"Operation and maintenance," \$175,000;"

And, in lieu thereof, insert: "Operation and maintenance," \$175,000;"

On page 48, line 19, after the word "expenses", strike out "\$1,740,000" and insert "\$1,940,000"; and, in the same line, after the amendment just above stated, insert a colon and "Provided, That \$200,000 of this appropriation shall be available only upon enactment into law of S. 2694, Ninety-first Congress, or similar legislation;"

On page 51, after line 22, insert:

"APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION

"Salaries and expenses", \$42,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for 'Appalachian regional development programs';"

On page 53, line 19, after the word "expenses", strike out "\$1,932,000" and insert "\$2,229,000".

On page 53, line 20, after the word "safety", strike out "\$1,780,000" and insert "\$2,324,000".

On page 53, line 22, after the word "recreation", strike out "\$652,000" and insert "\$899,000".

On page 53, line 23, after the word "welfare", strike out "\$4,478,000" and insert "\$4,624,000".

On page 54, line 2, after the word "engineering", strike out "\$1,096,000" and insert "\$1,905,000".

On page 54, line 5, after the word "follows", strike out "\$10,332,000" and insert "\$12,191,000"; in line 6, after the word "fund", strike out "\$533,000" and insert "\$535,000"; in line 8, after the word "parking", strike out "\$375,000" and insert "\$468,000"; and, at the beginning of line 9, strike out "\$250,000" and insert "\$339,000".

On page 62, line 13, after the word "exceed", strike out "\$3,000,000,000" and insert "\$6,000,000,000".

On page 63, after line 12, insert a new section, as follows:

"SEC. 604. Funds appropriated, or otherwise made available, by this Act for the fiscal year 1970, shall remain available for obligation until July 1, 1970, or for five days after the date of approval of this Act, whichever is later, unless a longer period is specifically provided: *Provided*, That all obligations incurred in anticipation of such appropriations and authority for the fiscal year 1970 as well as those for longer periods as set forth herein are hereby ratified and confirmed if in accordance with the terms hereof."

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I simply want to say that the able Senator from Nebraska (Mr. HRUSKA) is the ranking minority member of the subcommittee. While I have made my opening statement, I point out that he may wish to make an opening statement.

I therefore would like to yield to him at this time for that purpose.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from West Virginia. My statement will be short. It will review some of the high points of the second supplemental appropriations bill for 1970.

Mr. President, the second supplemental appropriation for 1970 is a big, complicated and important enactment. It has been the subject of long and serious deliberation by the committee, and much hard work by the committee staff. I take this opportunity to compliment them and particularly our hard-working and efficient chairman, the junior Senator from West Virginia. Throughout the hearings and the consideration of the measure, Senator BYRD rendered a superb service.

This bill, Mr. President, is notable for several reasons:

First, it contains almost six and a half billion dollars in new obligational authority. Of this \$4.3 billion is due to the costs of pay increases, the balance being partly for uncontrollable items and partly for new emphasis or new directions on selected Government activities.

Second, the bill contains \$150 billion for emergency assistance to school districts which are expected to desegregate by September of this year. This is in the nature of a stopgap to solve an immediate problem; the President has informed us of his intention to continue the program on a more regular basis, by amending the 1971 budget and including funds in the 1972 budget. Legislative authorization has been requested in the form of the proposed "Emergency School Aid Act of 1970" presently being considered in committee as S. 3883. The amount projected as needed during the next 2 years is \$1.5 billion.

Third, the bill contains language, in titles IV and V, to adjust the 1970 and 1971 expenditure ceilings. The revised ceilings reflect a more realistic estimate of budget outlays for the current year, and gives the President needed flexibility for 1971. In this connection, it should be noted that the issue is not one of thrift or profligacy on the part of the administration. Rather, it is the question of how accurate it is possible to be about the pace of expenditures caused by prior commitments of the Government and appropriations by the Congress. The administration would prefer that the expenditure limitation be eliminated altogether, but believes that the flexibility provided in this bill will be a workable substitute for such action. That is to say that uncontrollable items may total up to \$6 billion without requiring further congressional service.

Fourth, the bill contains \$50 million proposed by the administration, to support a program of summer employment for disadvantaged youth. These extra funds will permit useful and stimulating work experiences for young people during the summer months. This is a program of great importance and it should be supported at the highest possible level. The administration has advised the committee that the \$50 million contained in the bill is the limit of what can be effectively and efficiently used.

Mr. President, the supplemental bill contains other items of special interest to the people of Nebraska and of many other States across the Nation. For example, the bill contains \$8.7 million for hospital construction, to permit work to continue on 35 selected hospital projects already underway. The reduced appropriation for 1970, from the 1969 level of \$254 million, caught these hospitals with construction contracts, made in good faith, without funds to liquidate them. The amounts included in the bill will avoid funding deficits in these essential projects. Three of these hospitals were in Nebraska; the Mary Lanning Hospital, in Hastings, and the St. Elizabeth's Hospital, and Madonna Nursing Home in Lincoln. These three projects require \$292,000 to meet the obligations I have mentioned, and that amount is included in the supplemental.

Mr. President, I would also like to call attention to the increased amounts in this bill for homeownership and rental housing assistance for those whose income levels make most difficult the purchase or rental of adequate housing. The bill contains increases of \$35 million for programs under sections 235 of the Housing Act, and an identical amount for section 236 programs. These additional amounts will help to ease the housing shortage, particularly for our most needy families.

Mr. President, it is my earnest hope that the Senate will be able to move with dispatch on this important matter. The fiscal year to which it applies is almost over, and the bill includes items not yet formally considered by the House of Representatives. I believe this is a good bill and I recommend its speedy approval.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, do I understand that the bill is open to amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I call up my amendment and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

"URBAN RENEWAL PROGRAMS

"For grants for urban renewal, fiscal year 1970, as an additional amount for urban renewal programs, as authorized by title I of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1450 et seq.) and section 314 of the Housing Act of 1954, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1452a), \$587,500,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That no part of any appropriation in this Act shall be used for administrative expenses in connection with commitments for grants aggregating more than the total of amounts available in the current year from the amounts authorized for making such commitments through June 30, 1967, plus the additional amounts appropriated therefor."

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, the Senate will recall that last November when the regular bill making appropriations for housing came before the Senate, I was the manager of the bill. At that time an amendment was offered to add to the bill the \$587,500,000; that is in the amendment before us today. It was an increase over the estimate and is the balance of the authorization for fiscal year 1970. The difficulty then was not in the merit but in the matter of timing.

I cautioned the Members of the Senate at that time that it was not the proper time to bring up the amendment and that I thought it should be brought up on the supplemental bill.

We had a vote at that time on that amendment. It was rejected by only two votes. This strong support was because there was a strong feeling that our cities were in such a state of decay that something needed to be done—many of us felt a priority to do something about urban renewal.

Since that time, a number of very concerned mayors appeared before our committee. They have made the very strong assertion that if we will bring up the authorization for urban renewal and make these funds available, they will eliminate the ghettos of this country within a period of 5 years. They may be slightly overoptimistic but they deserve our support and I think it is a step in the right direction.

I repeat that when the amendment last came up, I resisted it purely on the grounds that it was not the proper time to bring it up. And I fear that because I was the manager of the bill and made that statement, that might have been the reason it did not carry especially since it lost by only two votes.

I hope that the amendment will carry this time.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator would withhold his request for the yeas and

nays. I would like to accept the amendment. I have discussed this with the able Senator from Rhode Island. I think he has a very meritorious amendment.

As chairman of the subcommittee which regularly handles this item, there is no inclination on my part or, on the part of anyone else I know of to oppose the amendment. I think it would save some time if we could agree to the amendment without the yeas and nays.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I would be perfectly willing to do that under ordinary circumstances. However, the thing that disturbs me concerns the weight of this measure in conference. I believe that if we can get a strong sentiment recorded by the Senate then the Senator from West Virginia would have a strong argument and a more effective hand to use in the conference.

I feel we ought to have the yeas and nays. We could have a fast vote.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the Senator has a right to ask for the yeas and nays. However, I wish he would not so that we might save time.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays, and this is not to hurt the Senator from West Virginia but to help him in conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second, and the yeas and nays are ordered.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I was the sponsor of the losing amendment.

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JAVITS. I am delighted that the Senator has taken this action. I think it is entirely fitting that he should be the one to do it.

I can affirm that this is the key to the problem relating to the debilitation and wreckage of our cities. This will help enormously to correct many problems in the housing area.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I made the promise last time that I would do exactly what I am doing. I am carrying out my promise. I am keeping my word.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. GURNEY). The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Rhode Island. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the role.

The assistant legislative clerk called the role.

Mr. KENNEDY. I announce that the Senator from Nevada (Mr. CANNON), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD), the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. GORE), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. HARRIS), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. HOLLINGS), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. MCCARTHY), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. MCCLELLAN), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. MCINTYRE), the Senator from Montana (Mr. METCALF), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. RUSSELL), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. TYDINGS), and the Senator from Texas (Mr. YARBOROUGH) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that the Senator from Nevada (Mr. BIBLE) is absent on official business.

I further announce that, if present and

voting, the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. MCINTYRE), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. HARRIS), and the Senator from Nevada (Mr. CANNON) would each vote "yea."

Mr. GRIFFIN. I announce that the Senator from Colorado (Mr. DOMINICK) and the Senators from Oregon (Mr. HATFIELD and Mr. PACKWOOD) are necessarily absent.

The Senator from South Dakota (Mr. MUNDT) is absent because of illness.

The Senator from California (Mr. MURPHY) is detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado (Mr. DOMINICK), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. HATFIELD), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. MUNDT), and the Senator from California (Mr. MURPHY) would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 70, nays 12, as follows:

[No. 162 Leg.]

YEAS—70

Alken	Griffin	Pastore
Allott	Hart	Pearson
Anderson	Hartke	Pell
Baker	Holland	Percy
Bayh	Hruska	Prouty
Boggs	Hughes	Proxmire
Brooke	Inouye	Randolph
Burdick	Jackson	Ribicoff
Byrd, Va.	Javits	Saxbe
Byrd, W. Va.	Jordan, N.C.	Schweiker
Case	Jordan, Idaho	Scott
Church	Kennedy	Smith, Maine
Cook	Long	Smith, Ill.
Cooper	Magnuson	Sparkman
Cranston	Mansfield	Spong
Dole	Mathias	Stennis
Eagleton	McGee	Stevens
Eastland	McGovern	Symington
Ellender	Miller	Talmadge
Ervin	Mondale	Williams, N.J.
Fong	Montoya	Young, N. Dak.
Fulbright	Moss	Young, Ohio
Goodell	Muskie	
Gravel	Nelson	

NAYS—12

Allen	Curtis	Hansen
Bellmon	Fannin	Thurmond
Bennett	Goldwater	Tower
Cotton	Gurney	Williams, Del.

NOT VOTING—18

Bible	Hatfield	Mundt
Cannon	Hollings	Murphy
Dodd	McCarthy	Packwood
Dominick	McClellan	Russell
Gore	McIntyre	Tydings
Harris	Metcalf	Yarborough

So Mr. PASTORE's amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. ELLENDER obtained the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me briefly?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, may we have order, so everyone can hear what the majority leader has to say?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, there will be further votes this evening. Some of them may well be rollcall votes. I would urge all Members of the Senate to stay as close to the floor as possible so that we can dispose of these amendments as they come along, and not be forced to wait for Senators who, through no fault of their own, may be delayed.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read the amendment, as follows:

On page 2, after line 12, insert the following:

"FOOD AND NUTRITION SERVICE FOOD
STAMP PROGRAM

"For necessary expenses of the Food Stamp Program pursuant to the Food Stamp Act of 1964, as amended, for the period July 1, 1970, to September 30, 1970, \$300,000,000, to be charged to the amount appropriated under this head in H.R. 17923, when enacted."

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, it will be recalled that last September the Senate passed the food stamp program, in which it was provided—

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair require Senators to take our seats, and Senators' aides to take seats in the rear of the Chamber or leave the Chamber.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey). The Sergeant at Arm is so ordered. Senators and aides will take their respective seats.

The Senator from Louisiana may proceed.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, as I just stated, last September the Senate passed the food stamp bill, in which it provided \$1.250 billion for fiscal 1970 and \$2 billion for fiscal 1971.

Under the present law, the authorization for the first 6 months of fiscal year 1971 is only \$170 million.

Last week Mr. Richard Lyng, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, appeared before the Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs and stated that the food stamp program was progressing at an expenditure rate of about \$87 million to \$90 million a month.

I understand that the Subcommittee on Appropriations for Agriculture of the House of Representatives has included in its appropriation bill for fiscal year 1971 \$1.250 billion for the food stamp program. That, of course, would be subject to the passage by Congress of the authorization bill.

In anticipation of the food stamp program being enacted by the House of Representatives, the House committee has recommended an appropriation of \$1.250 billion for fiscal 1971.

Since the present law provides for an authorization of only \$170 million for the entire 6 months beginning on July 1st, and since we are spending now at the rate of about \$90 million a month, it is necessary that we provide more funds so as to continue the food stamp program as outlined by Secretary Lyng.

The cost of the program under the present law would probably go up to from \$90 to \$95 million a month, and the purpose of my amendment is simply to provide funds for July, August, and September at a rate of not more than \$100 million a month, with the understanding that such funds be restored from the amount to be approved by Congress, for the Department of Agriculture for fiscal year 1971.

I urge that the amendment be adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. I consulted with my good friend the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. BYRD), and also with the Senator from Florida (Mr. HOLLAND), who handles the appropriation bills for agriculture, and both agree that they have no objection to the amendment.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the Senator from Louisiana states the case precisely. We have discussed the amendment, and I am willing to accept it.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I concur in that statement of the Senator from West Virginia, and also the statement of the Senator from Louisiana. As I understand it, the amendment would simply anticipate the amount that would normally fall within fiscal year 1971, and is within the authorization as already approved by this body.

Mr. ELLENDER. It is a little less.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I move to lay that motion on the table. The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. The Senator from Montana (Mr. MANSFIELD) proposes an amendment as follows:

On page 6 after line 13, insert the following:

"NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION
"SALARIES AND EXPENSES

"For expenses necessary to carry out the purposes of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1861-1875), \$8,800,000, to remain available until expended."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the pending amendment seeks to add \$8.8 million to the Supplemental Appropriations Act for the National Science Foundation. It is the intent of this amendment to give to the National Science Foundation an amount of funds—determined by the General Accounting Office in its report received in my office today—equivalent to those eliminated by the Department of Defense by the application of section 203 of the Military Procurement Authorization Act of 1970.

Section 203 provides that the Department of Defense will limit itself to the funding of research which has a direct and apparent relationship to a mission or function of that Department. It was enacted by the Congress on its own initiative and without the prior approval of the Department of Defense. The intent of section 203 was not to limit the Federal contribution for basic science but to rechannel the sponsorship to civilian agencies. The National Science Foundation was created in 1950 specifically for the purpose of sponsoring basic

research at our universities. The report from the General Accounting Office dated June 23, 1970, attributes cuts by Defense of \$8.8 million directly to this amendment during the fiscal year 1970. The research community especially at the universities has voiced no complaint to the philosophy or thrust of this amendment but hopes that Congress will fulfill its stated intention of providing the necessary funds to the National Science Foundation that are attributable to the application of this law. The \$8.8 million of this amendment does provide those additional funds for basic research; in addition its passage will serve as a symbol to the academic and research communities that Congress intends to fulfill the purpose of the amendment by effecting a transfer of the resources to the National Science Foundation.

It is important to stress that the effect of section 203 covered by this amendment is solely for funds cut during fiscal year 1970. The impact of section 203 for the following fiscal years has not yet been determined. It has been estimated that the reduction in sponsorship of basic research by the Federal Government this past year due to general budgetary cutbacks has been of the order of magnitude of \$40 to \$60 million. That sum as well as any others that may be cut for the coming fiscal year from mission oriented agencies should be compensated for in the regular appropriations to the National Science Foundation. I think it is very important for the Senate to keep its word and to compensate during this fiscal year for the effects of section 203 directly attributable to it during this fiscal year. As the sponsor of section 203 on the military procurement bill of last year, I feel that I have a particular responsibility in seeking the addition of these funds this year to this Supplemental Appropriations Act. I urge the adoption of this amendment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a letter addressed by me to the Senator from West Virginia, the chairman of the Supplemental Appropriations Subcommittee (Mr. BYRD), dated April 24, 1970. The report of the General Accounting Office dated June 23, 1970, will be a public record and the information upon which the figure is based may be obtained from that public report.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APRIL 24, 1970.

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD,
Chairman, Supplemental Appropriations
Subcommittee, Senate Committee on
Appropriations.

DEAR BOB: In the military authorization for FY 1970, Public Law 91-121, the Senate took an important step towards reducing the dependence of American science upon military appropriations. Section 203 of the Act specified:

None of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act may be used to carry out any research project or study unless such a project or study has a direct or apparent relationship to a specific military function or operations.

The principle of this amendment was strongly endorsed by the Appropriations Committee last year in its Committee report on the Defense Appropriations.

An underlying purpose in introducing Section 203 was to decouple the work of our scientists, particularly in colleges and universities, from military appropriations and to achieve a redistribution of Federal funds for research among other agencies so that the Defense Department would no longer be subject to the criticism of being a second National Science Foundation.

Since the authorization became law, the Defense Department has made a major review of its research projects to test them against Section 203. The latest information I have indicates that the Defense Department has so far disqualified somewhat more than 400 research projects with a total funding of over \$8 million.

Secretary Laird has accepted the principle of Section 203, that research not relevant to military programs should be eliminated. In testimony on February 20, 1970 before the Senate Armed Services and Appropriations Committees he indicated Defense was complying but went on to express his concern for the continuation of high-quality research affected by Section 203. He called for arrangements for its continued support by other agencies.

The General Accounting Office, at my request, has monitored Defense compliance with Section 203. From what the GAO reports, I am satisfied that the Department is taking Section 203 seriously. The Defense Department is doing its part. I believe that the Congress should do its part. There is general concern and even apprehension within the research community both at the Universities and at other research centers that there is an effort to diminish the Federal commitment to basic research which has contributed so much to the technological base which has given this country economic supremacy in the world. To reduce this research is not the aim of Section 203; to rechannel much of the research through the National Science Foundation is its aim.

It is important that our leading research teams and their facilities that are current and viable maintain their capacity, but more importantly that they maintain the confidence in the Congress that there is no diminution of the Federal commitment to research. By adding funds to the NSF corresponding to that amount eliminated by DOD this year, the Congress would be establishing its commitment to basic science and carrying out the promise of the principle of Section 203.

I hope that as Chairman of the Subcommittee on Supplemental Appropriations, you can favorably consider the addition to the supplemental appropriations for FY 1970 of \$8 million for the National Science Foundation. These funds should be restricted to funding of research projects under the auspices of National Science Foundation. Since the present NSF authorization under Public Law 91-120 is \$477,605,000 while the appropriations for FY 1970 is \$438,000,000, no further authorization is needed.

By making this modest supplemental appropriation to the NSF, the Congress will demonstrate a perspective that will restore some confidence in the research community. Perhaps more important than the dollars involved, it will also reaffirm Congressional support for the work of our leading scientists; that confidence is important, for in the years ahead we will need their efforts more than ever.

Sincerely yours,

MIKE MANSFIELD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Montana.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I had intended to insert in the RECORD the letter addressed to me on April 24 which has now been put in the RECORD by the able majority leader. I am glad that he has done so.

Through inadvertence, I did not have any hearings conducted on this request. I was embarrassed because, through inadvertence, I failed to go into the matter. I brought the matter to the attention of the full committee during markup, but it was without the statement of the majority leader at that time, since he was not able to be present upon that occasion.

I would certainly want to see the Senate accept this amendment. I think it is a very meritorious one, and I am inclined to urge the Senate to approve it. Again, I express my apologies to the majority leader for not looking into the matter while we had hearings.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator need not apologize. He has always been more than kind and cooperative to me as well as to other Members of this body. All of us lose things from time to time, but it is rare when the Senator from West Virginia does so.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, for fiscal 1971, the National Science Foundation has asked for \$511 million. The House of Representatives cut that amount by \$16 million. Their representative has appeared before our committee, asking for restoration of the \$16 million. I think he made a meritorious case. I realize there has been a burden placed upon the National Science Foundation because of the Mansfield amendment, because many of the research contracts which cannot now be undertaken by the Department of Defense are being turned over to the National Science Foundation, and it creates new problems. I think there is tremendous merit in the amendment, and I support it.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, first of all, I think the chairman of the committee ought to be exonerated from any responsibility in this matter, because at the time the matter was brought up, at the markup of the bill, I was not aware of the situation, and also the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island, who is chairman of the Subcommittee on Independent Offices, was not present at that time, being away on official duties.

I have only one thing to say about this matter: I shall not oppose the amendment, but since it does take up certain things that have been considered in the request that is being made by the National Science Foundation, I think it is only fair to say that we ought to adjust and will attempt to adjust the National Science Foundation appropriation accordingly when the subcommittee meets tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I agree with the distinguished chairman. As I say, I think it is very fair. It allows us to meet a need for this fiscal year, and

to keep faith with the representations that were made last year when section 203 became the law. The general level of funding of the National Science Foundation should consider not only the direct effects of section 203, but also the reduction in the Federal contribution to the sponsorship of basic science generally, caused primarily by the budgetary squeeze throughout the Federal Establishment. The level of basic research sponsored by the Federal Government should not be reduced but the emphasis for channeling these funds should be shifted from Defense to the National Science Foundation.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I want to support the Mansfield amendment to the second supplemental appropriation bill. This amendment will help ease the present crisis in basic scientific research, a crisis which gravely concerns the scientific community and should concern all Americans.

I should like to point out, however, that this amendment is only a first step. It is meant to offset section 203 of the 1970 Defense Procurement Authorization Act which prohibited the Department of Defense from supporting research not directly related to a specific military function or operation. But, contrary to popular belief, section 203 is not by itself responsible for most of the recent cuts in Federal support for basic research. The Department of Defense in fiscal year 1970 has reduced its support for academic research by about \$25 million, and less than \$9 million of this is attributable to section 203. Furthermore, NASA and the AEC have reduced their research support programs by a total of about \$35 million, even though section 203 does not apply to them at all.

In other words, the Federal Government in fiscal year 1970 reduced its support for basic research by about \$60 million. The amendment today offsets only a fraction of that cutback. If academic science is not to be severely crippled more must be done. It is for that reason that as chairman of the Special Subcommittee on the NSF I have requested a \$50 million increase in the NSF authorization for fiscal year 1971. The Labor and Public Welfare Committee has approved this increase and I hope the Senate will do the same when the authorization bill comes to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Montana.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, shortly I intend to offer three amendments directed at the emergency assistance desegregation program appearing on page 14 of H.R. 17399, the second supplemental appropriations bill. Before doing so, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PELL) without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, as chairman of the Education Subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I am aware of and concerned about the special problems of school districts carrying out desegregation plans. Indeed, the subcommittee is presently considering legislation to deal with these very problems. It is my hope that, if possible, the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare will bring legislation on this matter before the Senate this session.

My concern with the appropriation proposed by the Committee on Appropriations stems from the fact that this recommendation is before the Senate without proper legislative authority, and without due consideration by the substantive committee charged by the rules of the Senate with responsibility over the subject matter of the appropriation.

At this time, rather than raise a question respecting a point of order against the appropriation, I would prefer having a clarification of this matter. I choose this procedure, because it would appear that if the intent of the committee is made more precise than has already been expressed, it is possible that a point of order would not be necessary. Therefore, I would like to express my support for the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. MONDALE), in his efforts to pinpoint the situation and to make a brief statement outlining the scope of the activities which would be funded under the appropriation in a manner consistent with the authorizing legislation, thereby bringing the committee amendment within the limits of the rules of the Senate.

First, I would hope that the manager of the bill would make absolutely clear that the activities funded from the appropriation will be only those authorized by substantive law, in accordance with the terms of the authorizing legislation, and without regard to the statement of intent on page 22 of the report of the Committee on Appropriations on this bill. Specifically, the report states that these funds will be used for hiring teachers without limitation. A review of the authorizing legislation indicates that schoolteachers may be hired with Federal funds only as a part of a specific project authorized by law.

Second, I would hope that it would be made clear that this appropriation does not constitute a precedent. Otherwise, the whole function of substantive committees will be subverted by the appropriation process. It is my belief that the Senate ought not lend itself to a procedure too often used by this administration, whereby the normal rules are bypassed in favor of shortcuts for political reasons. If this administration finds that it can, as a matter of course, come to the Appropriations Committee for emergency appropriations whether or not an emergency exists, there will be no reason for submitting legislation to substantive committees. If we accede to this procedure, Congress will, in domestic affairs, have divested itself of its responsibility in much the same way as has been the case in the past with our Nation's defense.

I would address this question to the Senator from West Virginia, as to whether or not he can give up these two assurances: One, that the money would be spent only on programs that are already authorized by substantive law.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. The answer is "Yes."

Mr. PELL. Second, this would not be considered as a precedent for future legislation in this field.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. It would not be, as I understand it, because we have been advised by the General Counsel of the Department of HEW that this request has already been authorized, and the authorization sources are set forth in the bill, on page 14.

Mr. PELL. Coming to those sources, with respect to title II of the Economic Opportunity Act, \$100 million, and then the other \$50 million from title IV of the Civil Rights Act, the Cooperative Research Act, the dropout prevention program in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and the Education Professions Development Act, I wonder whether the Senator could inform us—or if it could be submitted later in the RECORD—as to how much money is to be appropriated under each of these programs. I think we should know the authority under which we are appropriating funds.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. In answer to the question by the able Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PELL), \$115 million would be for special educational personnel and students' programs, \$15 million for community participation programs, \$17.9 million for equipment and minor remodeling, and \$2.1 million for Federal administration and technical assistance, making a total of \$150 million.

Mr. PELL. I should like to press the point as to the source of the funds. Of the \$50 million that comes out of the four different authorities, is there anywhere available a breakdown of how much will come out of each of those authorities?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. This precise information was not supplied to the committee. The Department of Health, Education and Welfare has asked for some flexibility in this regard, but for nothing that would exceed the existing authority as set out in the bill.

Mr. PELL. The thing that concerns me is to leave to HEW the authority to take the whole \$50 million out of one of the 4 programs or to divide it up on a fairly equitable basis. I think we are being very generous with the authority we give the executive branch. How does the Senator feel about that?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. As I have said, the Department wanted to have the flexibility that it thought it would need, and the basic authorizing legislation has been passed heretofore. The appropriations request is grounded in the legislative authority that has already been granted by Congress and would come from several different authorities as set forth in the bill and detail in the justification.

This is the first part of the \$1.5 billion which the President has envisioned

as being needed in his program for the desegregation of public schools, and this \$150 million would come out of that, leaving \$1.350 billion as an amount yet to be authorized and requested. So we can either appropriate it now or we can appropriate it later.

Mr. PELL. I am concerned with the intent of Congress in passing these authorization items, for specific programs. If the money can be appropriated under the authority of one program and not all four, it would mean that we give the administration far too much discretion to gut a program. I would like some sort of assurance, as chairman of the authorizing subcommittee, to the effect that the money would be fairly evenly used in all four programs.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I think the money would be evenly withdrawn. It would be spread around among the various authorities, and I do not think any one of the authorities would be gutted, to use the able Senator's term. This was the testimony the committee received from the Department and this is what their justification implies.

Mr. MONDALE. Might I pursue the questioning offered by the Senator from Rhode Island to the floor manager of this bill. Do I correctly understand that the floor manager is not in a position to advise the Senate as to the sources from which this \$150 million would be obtained or the amount of money that would be taken from any such sources, whatever they might be?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. The \$100 million would come out of title 2 of the OEO authority, and the remaining \$50 million would be spread out through the programs I have already enumerated—community participation program, equipment and minor remodeling, and Federal administration and technical assistance, under the Office of Education. Let me state further that funds would be allocated on the basis of approved applications—under this circumstance, absolute determination is difficult to ascertain at this time.

Mr. MONDALE. My question is not directed at this point to the authorities through which this appropriated money would be spent, but, rather, to the question of the sources from which the \$150 million would be derived.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I think I have already indicated that in answer to the earlier question by the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. MONDALE. What was the answer?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. The answer was that we were not supplied with that information and until applications for the funds are received and approved by the Commissioner of Education this is a determination that is difficult to make. However, an estimate of needs would indicate that funds would come from the various authorities set forth by the Department.

Mr. MONDALE. We do not know where this \$150 million will be found?

Mr. PELL. \$50 million.

Mr. MONDALE. \$50 million or \$150 million?

Mr. PELL. We do not know where the

\$50 million comes from. We know where the \$100 million come from. The \$50 million is a sort of shell game.

Mr. MONDALE. Can the Senator advise me as to how much of the \$150 million would be spent through part D of the Education Professions Development Act?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I beg the Senator's pardon for not being able to respond promptly. If I recall correctly—the Senator may be in a position to correct me if I am wrong—the first indica-

tion I had had from the Senator that he intended to raise any questions whatsoever about this matter came on the day we were marking up the bill in the full committee.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point a breakdown on how the distribution of funds are to be made according to the justification.

There being no objection, the justification was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OFFICE OF EDUCATION, EMERGENCY SCHOOL ASSISTANCE

1970					
Presently available		Revised estimate		Increase	
Position	Amount	Position	Amount	Position	Amount
Special educational personnel and student programs					
			\$115,000,000		+\$115,000,000
Community participation program					
			15,000,000		+15,000,000
Equipment and minor remodeling					
			17,900,000		+17,900,000
Federal administration and technical assistance					
		100	2,100,000	+100	+2,100,000
Total obligations					
		100	150,000,000	+100	+150,000,000

GENERAL STATEMENT

School districts will be encouraged to review carefully the local problems anticipated during the desegregation process, identifying programs and resources to overcome their problems. Funding will be based upon each district's needs rather than a standard program. School districts will be required to carefully plan their programs and build in evaluation components designed to assess the program's effectiveness in meeting stated objectives. State and Federal personnel will be available to provide assistance in the identification of problems, the development of program requirements, and the management of the program.

The following estimates by program activity represent a rough approximation of how the supplemental request will be used. It is based upon the judgments of present Office of Education staff who have been working closely with southern school superintendents. Although needs will vary from one school district to another, it is expected that approvable projects will need to be both large enough and comprehensive enough to make a difference. If the objective of this program—to maintain quality education during desegregation—is to be realized, projects will have to be multi-faceted. Community participation, special personnel and services, administrative and logistical help, and technical assistance are all important elements of a successful program.

A supplemental appropriation of \$150 million would provide an average of \$150,000 for each of the approximately 1,000 eligible school districts. Assuming an average of 10 schools per school district, this would mean about \$15,000 per school.

In total, the target population includes about 7.2 million students, of whom 2.5 million are minority students, and approximately 335,000 educational personnel.

Presently available, ———.

Revised estimate, \$115,000,000.

Increase, +\$115,000,000.

1. Special educational personnel and student programs:

The following activities would be supported:

A. SPECIAL PERSONNEL

Temporary teachers—to provide release time for regular instructional personnel to participate in desegregation workshop activities.

Teacher aides—to reduce pupil-teacher ratios in order to give more attention to individual students.

Special guidance and counseling and testing staff—to assist and counsel principals, teachers, and students in order to provide educational programs that will remedy student deficiencies.

Monitors—parents in the school community to perform services that will reduce potential behavioral problems on school buses and school grounds.

Crossing guards—to provide staff that will maximize safety precautions for children who may be taking new and different routes to school.

Administrative and clerical staff—to provide additional personnel and time for implementation of desegregation plans, e.g., additional month of employment during summer for principals.

B. STUDENT SERVICES

Remedial programs—to provide specialists, books and supplies for remediation in all subject areas in which students are deficient.

Guidance and counseling—to provide adequate guidance and counseling staff in order to deal with student adjustment problems resulting from the desegregation process.

Diagnostic evaluation and testing programs—to provide diagnosticians trained to evaluate special sight, hearing and psychological problems of students.

Work-study programs—to provide children from poverty level families with specially-designed school programs that would afford them financial assistance so as to continue their education.

Health and nutrition services—to provide specialized personnel and services for students having health and nutrition deficiencies.

Dropout prevention programs.

Student relations to provide special programs designed to assist students on problems such as acceptance, behavior, dress codes, etc.

C. EDUCATIONAL PERSONNEL DEVELOPMENT

Seminars on problems incident to desegregation to provide training with skilled experts in the area of human relations so as to minimize problems incident to desegregation.

Seminars on teacher interpersonal relationships—to facilitate positive interpersonal relations among educational personnel through training by skilled professionals in an intercultural understanding.

Utilization of university expertise through institutes and inservice programs to deal with such problems as:

Teaching bilingual children.

Teaching children with speech and dialect deficiencies.

Attitudes and problems of teachers, parents and students involved in the desegregation process.

Upgrading basic skills and instructional methodologies of teachers in English, math, science, social sciences, language arts, etc.

D. CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT

Utilization of expert consultants to shape and design new curricula approaches and to introduce curriculum innovations that would serve children with multi-ethnic backgrounds.

New and varied instructional materials.

Improved evaluation and assessment of student progress.

E. SPECIAL DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS

Projects for introduction of innovative instructional methodologies which will improve the quality of education in the desegregated school:

Individualized instruction.

Master teachers.

Team teaching.

Non-graded programs.

Special projects involving community agencies and parents—to develop joint projects between special-interest and civic groups, parents and the schools which would promote understanding among citizens. Such projects could include sponsoring city-wide and countywide art and music festivals, public meetings on relevant school problems (drug abuse, behavior, etc.).

Exemplary instructional practices—to operate pilot projects which would demonstrate exemplary instructional practices suitable for systemwide replication and for other school districts involved in the desegregation process.

F. STATE AND LOCAL PLANNING AND ADMINISTRATION

Expand technical assistance capabilities at the State education agency level—to provide additional personnel to assist the local education agency in planning for desegregation.

Temporary staff at the local level to handle administrative details and clerical duties—to provide additional temporary staff to deal with the logistics of changing from a dual to a unitary system. For example, re-scheduling of students and teachers, re-drawing transportation routes, supervision of necessary physical changes (moving of equipment, building renovation, etc.).

Staff at the local level for planning and supervising the implementation of the desegregation plan.

2. Community participation programs:

Presently available —————

Revised estimate ————— \$15,000,000

Increase ————— +15,000,000

The following activities would be supported:

A. PUBLIC INFORMATION ACTIVITIES

Community information programs for parents, teachers, and students—to provide factual information about the desegregation plan and school programs.

Public information coordinator—to provide for a person on superintendent's staff to promote public information activities.

B. COMMUNITY PROGRAMS

Establishment and support of a biracial committee.

School-home visitation programs—an activity to be performed by educational personnel to assist with dissemination of information about school programs and student progress in the desegregated school.

Special parent programs—to provide programs designed to increase parents' involvement with the schools' programs, i.e. PTA, Education Emphasis Week, etc.

Community-relations coordinator—to provide a person on superintendent's staff to

plan, organize and implement programs for students and parents involved in the desegregation process.

Special demonstration projects designed to keep communication open, build understanding and develop community support.

3. Equipment and minor remodeling:

Presently Available	
Revised Estimate	\$17,900,000
Increase	+\$17,900,000

	Presently available		Revised estimate		Increase	
	Position	Amount	Position	Amount	Position	Amount
Federal administration and technical assistance:						
Personnel compensation and benefits	100	\$1,397,000	+100	+\$1,397,000		
Other expenses		703,000		+703,000		
Total	100	2,100,000	+100	+2,100,000		

An amount of \$2.1 million and 100 positions is requested to administer the Emergency School Assistance Program. This new effort will require:

Developing entirely new procedures and regulations which will allow the Office of Education to administer a unified, coordinated program within the six separate authorities under which funds are being requested. This will include notices to potential grantees of the terms and conditions under which grants will be available, unified application forms, regulation notices in the Federal Register, and review, approval, award and accounting procedures.

Assisting schools and other interested parties in the development of applications.

Reviewing and monitoring an estimated 1,000-1,500 projects for assistance.

Providing program assistance and disseminating information to hundreds of State and local school officials.

In addition to these direct program services, a small supporting staff will be necessary in Washington and the regional offices to coordinate program activities, provide general guidance and other necessary administrative functions such as accounting, grants management and personnel.

Of the 100 additional positions requested, 82 will be professional staff and 18 will be secretarial and clerical positions. Eighty-one will be located in the three southern HEW regional offices with 19 in Washington, D.C.

The additional professional positions are required for the following specific purposes: *Project development, review, monitoring and evaluation, add 50 positions.*

Fifty education program specialists will be required to handle the several phases of the some 1,000 project applications anticipated. This will mean that each specialist will be handling approximately 20 projects of varying size and scope. Because of the short lead-time involved and the unfamiliarity of many of the target school districts with developing proposals, it is expected that this workload will be quite demanding and fully justify the additional staff requested. Program specialists will need to go out and talk with local school officials, inform them of the assistance available, help them develop acceptable applications, help them with devising educationally sound programs, help with the installation of evaluation components and finally, monitor projects throughout the year, helping to make modifications as plans change and programs develop.

Development of program guidelines, program models and evaluation techniques, add 12 positions.

The following activities will be supported:

Procurement and relocation of temporary classrooms (trailers, mobile facilities and demountables).

Procurement and relocation of equipment and classroom furniture, including replacement of obsolete items.

Minor building renovation and remodeling for general upgrading of a facility including painting, modernizing, and partitioning.

Twelve program development specialists will help develop materials which can be used by education program specialists in working with local school officials. This will include information on successful projects in other States and communities. The program guidelines and models will indicate, for example, what goes into making a successful guidance and counseling program, bilingual education program, special reading program, etc. These specialists will be educators who have a sound background in these special fields.

Developing uniform grant and contract terms and conditions, add 8 positions.

Eight specialists will be required to help develop common rules and regulations for the award of grants and contracts. These will include such subjects as the disposition and accountability of equipment, determination of allowable costs, etc. This is an extremely important task in view of the several legislative authorities involved. It will be important to develop a common set of rules which will satisfy all the authorities involved.

Management and administrative overhead, add 12 positions.

The above staff will in turn require certain central support in both the regions and Washington. This will include persons in administrative services, accounting, personnel operations, and management. Eight of these positions will be in the regional offices.

It is important to emphasize that while certain minimum Federal requirements on accountability of funds and other matters must be met by all school districts, the program assistance and development will be strictly optional at the discretion of local school officials. There is no intention of having the Office of Education offering gratuitous advice. It is expected, however, that many schools will welcome whatever help is available. Many of the staff involved will be drawn from the local region and will be selected for their judgment, maturity, and experience as well as professional competence.

Even though the program funds will have to be obligated by September 30, 1970, most projects will probably continue throughout the school year. For this reason, a special provision has been included in the appropriation language which will make funds for administrative activities available through June 30, 1971. To launch this program as soon as possible, it is expected that some existing staff will be diverted to start up the program. For this reason, it is expected that the 100 new positions will be on board for approximately 85 percent of the fiscal year.

ADMINISTRATIVE FUNDS FOR EMERGENCY SCHOOL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

Personnel compensation:	
Permanent	\$1,200,000
Positions other than permanent	100,000
Other personnel compensation	
Subtotal, personnel compensation	1,300,000
Personnel benefits (7.5 percent)	97,000
Travel and transportation of persons (71 employees times \$50 per diem times 90 days)	313,000
Transportation of things	
Rent, communication, and utilities	207,000
(GSA, 100 employees times \$900 lapsed 15 percent)	(77,000)
(Utilities—100 employees times \$1,300)	(130,000)
Printing and reproduction (100 employees times \$420)	42,000
Other services (100 employees times \$900 lapsed 15 percent)	77,000
Supplies and materials (100 employees times \$140)	14,000
Equipment (100 times \$500)	50,000
Total	2,100,000
Total number of permanent employees	100
Full-time equivalent of others	12
Average number of all employees	97
Average cost per man year	\$14,410

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—OFFICE OF EDUCATION—EMERGENCY SCHOOL ASSISTANCE

Positions	Grade Number	Annual salary
Education program officer	GS-15	5 \$114,425
Education program specialist	GS-14	16 314,288
Program analyst	GS-14	3 58,929
Education program specialist	GS-13	20 335,200
Grants and contract specialist	GS-13	1 16,760
Education program specialist	GS-12	14 198,688
Grants and contract specialist	GS-12	6 85,152
Education program specialist	GS-11	2 23,810
Management analyst	GS-11	2 23,810
Grants and contract specialist	GS-11	1 11,905
Budget analyst	GS-11	1 11,905
Education program specialist	GS-9	6 59,286
Do.	GS-7	2 16,178
Personnel staffing assistant	GS-7	1 8,089
Accounting technician	GS-7	2 16,178
Secretary	GS-6	5 36,470
Do.	GS-5	8 52,384
Clerk-typist	GS-4	3 17,559
Do.	GS-2	2 9,242
Total		100 1,410,258

Mr. MONDALE. Can the Senator tell me how much will be spent through the Cooperative Research Act?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. As I indicated earlier, we just do not have that breakdown with respect to the authority. If the Senator is going to go down through each item—what authority is this from, what authority is that from—as I have already indicated, the committee does not have that information and it is contingent upon approved applications.

Mr. MONDALE. In other words, we do not know from which programs the \$150 million will be derived, nor do we know in what amounts the \$150 million will be spent through the respective authorities.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. We only know that the Department indicated it wanted some flexibility, and that it would be spread out in an even and fair manner. That is all I can say to the Senator.

Mr. MONDALE. Thus, it would be fair to say, since we do not know where the money is coming from, or what amounts will be spent under which titles, that we

have given them all the authority they could possibly ask for.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. That is the Senator's judgment, and I would not challenge it.

Mr. MONDALE, Mr. President, I am pleased to say that the three amendments which I shall shortly be calling up are supported by the administration in a letter which I received today from Secretary Finch which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
Washington, D.C., June 19, 1970.

HON. WALTER F. MONDALE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: This is in response to your request for the Department's views on the proposed amendments 702, 703 and 704 to the Second Supplemental Appropriations Bill.

These amendments refer to the appropriation of \$150 million included in the Bill for emergency assistance to desegregating school systems.

Amendment No. 702 provides that no funds may be extended to school districts which have transferred property or services to private schools that practice discrimination on the basis of race, color, or national origin.

Amendment No. 703 prohibits the use of appropriated funds to supplant funding from non-Federal sources which has been reduced as a result of desegregation. Also, the amendment provides that assistance under the appropriation could only be used to supplement State and local funds which would otherwise be made available to support educational programs in the affected school districts.

Amendment No. 704 would make clear that any school district in the process of implementing a Federal court order for desegregation would be eligible for assistance under the appropriation. In addition, school districts desegregating pursuant to a State court order would be eligible for assistance providing that such orders are being implemented and that as a minimum they provide for the elimination of practice prohibited under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1954.

The Department believes that the amendments are consistent with the purpose of the appropriation, which is to assist school districts meet their responsibilities under the law.

With kind regards, I am

Sincerely,

ROBERT H. FINCH,
Secretary.

Mr. PELL. Will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. MONDALE. I yield.

Mr. PELL. My arithmetic is not of the best but I did get some figures which I think are accurate. The problem is that the \$150 million is not divided up on a relatively even basis. It could, I suppose, completely overpower at least two of the programs for which the appropriation would be made because the total appropriation for the dropout prevention program is \$5.8 million and the total appropriation for planning and evaluation is \$13 million. Thus, I think that the Senator from West Virginia can see that, if these funds are appropriated for this purpose instead of that authorized, those programs could well be wiped out. That is why I think we are giving greater au-

thority to the executive branch and have abnegated the congressional responsibility.

There are two reasons why I think we go along with it. One, we recognize that there is a real problem in moving ahead with desegregation this coming school year; and, second, we think the authorizing subcommittee will handle the remainder of the bill, the other \$1.350 billion in the coming week—we hope.

But it is, to my mind, wrong and bad procedure, one which I believe a point of order could be made to—although I do not intend to do that, because the only ones who will suffer will be the young people in our Nation's schools.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, would it be convenient for the Senator from Minnesota to yield to me so that I may ask a few questions of the Senator from West Virginia? Inquiry has been made as to where the authorization has come from, and now I want to ask a few questions as to where the money is going. So that we can get it in the record in the same place.

Mr. MONDALE. That is correct. I asked the same questions and I will be glad to listen to the answers.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator has already asked those questions?

Mr. MONDALE. No. Proceed. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. I appreciate the Senator's courtesy. I invite attention to page 14 of the bill where the language with respect to the emergency school assistance fund is found, the \$150 million in question that is in the bill. Reference has already been made as to where the authorization originates.

My question is, where is this money going to?

Who is going to be eligible to get it?

Is all the money to be earmarked for the South or are the northern schools entitled to share in it?

If the northern and eastern schools share in it, will they have to desegregate in order to get the money, or are we going to pay it to them without desegregating?

Would the Senator inform me about that?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the allocation of these funds would be going to the 17 Southern and border States—whatever that means. I am not trying to be impertinent, but I said that as I did because I asked the same thing of the HEW.

Mr. STENNIS. Yes.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I said, "What do you mean by border State? Is West Virginia a border State? Is Delaware a border State? Is Oklahoma a border State? And so forth. They indicated to me that they would rather not try to answer that question and hoped that I would not persist in asking it.

Mr. STENNIS. What reason did they give for not allocating any money to the Northern, Eastern, and Western States?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. They said: "In the 17 Southern and border States." I think I would have to take issue with part of that, at least, that is

where most of the problems lay anent de jure segregation as to the entire amount of \$150 million.

Mr. Allen, former Commissioner of Education, who appeared before the subcommittee, said that it represented a rough guess as to the amount. I was not satisfied with that kind of answer, that it was a rough guess, and I so stated. I also stated that I did not feel the subcommittee should be asked to appropriate \$150 million on the basis of a rough guess.

Here are a few items, if I might enumerate some of them. They are the activities that will be supported by these moneys:

Under special personnel, temporary teachers, to provide release times for regulation instructional personnel participation in desegregated workshop activities.

Teacher aids. To reduce teacher ratios in order to give more attention to individual students.

Special guidance, counseling and testing staff. To assist in counseling principals, teachers, and students, in order to provide educational programs that will remedy student deficiencies.

Crossing guards. To provide staff that will maximize safety precautions for children taking new and different routes to school.

Administrative and clerical staff, to provide additional personnel and time for implementation of desegregation plans; for example, an additional month of employment during summer for principal.

Under student services, remedial programs, to provide specialist books and supplies. For remediation in all subject areas in which students are deficient.

Guidance and counseling, to provide adequate guidance and counseling staff in order to deal with student adjustment problems resulting from desegregation process.

Diagnostic and evaluation and testing programs.

Work study programs.

Health and nutrition services.

Dropout prevention programs.

Under educational personnel development, seminars on problems incident to desegregation, to provide training with skilled experts in the area of human relations, to minimize problems incident to desegregation.

Seminars on teachers interpersonal relationships.

Youth organization and university expertise through institute and inservice programs, to deal with such problems as teaching bilingual children.

Teaching children with speech and dialect deficiencies.

Problems of teachers, parents, and students involved in the desegregation process.

Upgrading basic skills and methodology of teachers in mathematics, social sciences, and so forth.

Mr. STENNIS. Does the Senator consider that sufficient?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. No; I think the Senator asked a very important question, and I think it should be answered to the very best of my ability.

I want to say also that a part of this would be for curriculum development. I think the Senator has a right to ask the question, and he has the right to know. I am attempting to state for him the information given to the subcommittee as to what activities would be supported by these funds such as special demonstration projects, special projects involving community agencies and parents, and exemplary instructional practices. Then there was another category, which is called planning and administration. And there are community participation programs, and so on, and so on. This enumeration has been inserted into the RECORD for the purpose of classification.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator. Is it true that the justification was based entirely on the Southern States and the so-called border States?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I cannot recall any exceptions.

Mr. STENNIS. What was said about the rest of the \$1.5 billion? Are the Southern and the border States going to get all of the \$1.5 billion? I have not heard that point covered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, my impression is that they will get most of the rest of it, but that it would not be confined to that.

As I understand it—and others were present at the hearings—this is going to be utilized to treat the problems of de jure segregation. As I further understand it, most of that problem is confined to the Southern and border States. However, nothing more than the \$150 million we are now considering has been authorized and the \$1.350 billion will have to be approved by the Congress.

Mr. STENNIS. Did any of the witnesses, according to the Senator's information, actually come out and say that the \$1.5 billion was going to be spent solely on the so-called de jure segregation question or situation? In fact, I cannot conceive of plans to give the South \$1.5 billion and not give any to any other area of the country.

I see no signs whatsoever that they are trying to desegregate any other part of the country than the South. So I think that we ought to have an understanding here as to where this money is going and what the pattern is for the spending of the rest of the \$1.5 billion.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I do not think that the witnesses stated that the moneys would be used for that purpose only. I do not think that this is the intention.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is talking about the \$150 million or the \$1.5 billion?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I am talking about the \$1.5 billion.

Mr. STENNIS. And there was no suggestion that a part of that money would be spent in the North and East and the Far West, and, if there ever was, under what conditions it would be spent.

My point is that I see no real plan to desegregate the schools outside the South. However, I do see evidence of plans for about \$1 billion to go to those schools, whether they desegregate or not. That is the point I raise.

Of course, the Senator agrees that this is relevant.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. It surely is; yes.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I do not believe that this plan has gotten beyond the newspaper stage, except for the \$150 million.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I think the Senator is right. The \$1,350 million would have to be authorized by the legislative committee; and I think they would have to go into it very thoroughly.

Mr. STENNIS. I think the Senator is correct. But I wanted to inquire about the plans so far as they are developed now. As a matter of fact, I have the record here. The Department of Justice has been in on six cases since 1964 outside of the Southern and the border States.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Practically speaking, that is the impression that I have.

Mr. STENNIS. The HEW has really proceeded in only 14 cases outside of the Southern and border States and has not cut off money for any schools outside the South as yet. That is my information. There has not been a real cutoff.

So I want to know now if they are going to get a part of this \$1.5 billion or are going to be required to desegregate or continue as they are at the present time.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I yield first to the Senator from Nebraska and will then yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, that subject was touched upon in the President's message of March 24, 1970.

I read those words:

In order to give substance to these commitments, I shall ask Congress to divert \$500 million from my original budget request for other domestic programs for fiscal year 1971, to be put instead into programs for improving education in racially impacted areas, North and South. And for assisting school districts in meeting special problems incident to court ordered desegregation for fiscal year 1972, I have ordered that \$1 billion be budgeted for the same purposes.

The bill authorizing the \$1.5 billion has not been considered by Congress. It will be for Congress to decide if it is necessary to limit or to expand the purposes for that requested authorization.

No one can say with absolute certainty to what uses these moneys will be put, until the authorizing legislation has been enacted.

We do have an explanation of what the President's ideas on the subject are, and what he proposes. But, it is Congress that disposes, and we do not know what that disposition will be.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I do not want to take too much of the Senator's time. I will conclude in a moment, if I may continue.

Mr. President, that was my point. It has never been said definitely by the President or by Congress where this money is going or whether they are going to require these schools to desegregate.

We know what they will require in the South. But the President has never said

that he will require them to desegregate in the North. He says it will be used for the benefit of schools in racially impacted areas.

Mr. HRUSKA. North and South.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is correct. So that means that in Chicago, the schools are racially impacted, I suppose. When we talk about 80 percent of the Negro students there who are attending schools that are between 99 percent and 100 percent Negro racial composition, I judge that is racially impacted. They would be eligible for this money. That is my point.

There is no plan to desegregate those schools, so far as the Federal Government is concerned. My prediction is that we will be asked to vote the \$1.5 billion here for the benefit of schools generally, without any requirement whatsoever for desegregation of the schools. That is the point I make.

I just want to bring it out. I thank the Senator very much for yielding.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Mississippi. I agree with the Senator's observation about the reach of this \$150 million.

In its presentation before the Appropriations Subcommittee, the administration said that the \$150 million requested in this supplemental appropriation would provide immediate assistance to the approximately 994 de jure school districts in 17 Southern and border States which recently developed and which must develop its desegregation plans by September 1970.

I see no reason for limiting the scope of this matter to any such definition.

My third amendment, No. 704, would assure that school districts desegregating under legal requirement across the Nation would be eligible for assistance under this appropriation.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I commend the Senator. It was on my motion that the language in the report which applied to the South and the border States alone was stricken. I made the point that we had no right to limit the application of this money to any area.

I did point out with respect to justifying the expenditure of this money for the benefit of any schools that there are no plans now to do anything about desegregating any schools except in the South or maybe the so-called border States.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, we will have an opportunity to vote on that measure in my third amendment, which I hope very much will help to give this appropriation a national effect.

May I say that the proposed legislation for assisting desegregating school districts, which is before the Education Subcommittee ably chaired by the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PELL), is now under serious consideration.

Speaking for myself, I would very much hope that some of the thrust in terms of both this appropriation and the proposed legislation can to be directed on a national basis.

Mr. STENNIS. If they desegregate, I agree with the Senator.

Mr. MONDALE. We are very desirous, or at least I am very desirous, that the

effort we are now undertaking be national in character and not limited to any one area. My amendment, number 704, seeks to make these funds available to any school districts desegregating under law—regardless of their location or the source of the legal requirement.

Mr. STENNIS. I agree they are entitled to the money if they are desegregated. I say the plan is they are going to give it to them if they are desegregated or not, if they are in racially impacted areas.

Mr. MONDALE. I thank the Senator for his observations.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONDALE. I yield.

Mr. PELL. Under the definitions of the objectives of S. 3883, the bill introduced by the senior Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS) and cosponsored by me, the definitions do not apply to any geographical area, just North, South, East, and West, which, when met, would bring in eligibility for funds under this act.

The point that worries me is that once the bill has been enacted, we leave it to the wisdom and discretion of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare as to how he allocates the money, and he can allocate it all in one State or in one section of the country, if he wishes. The amendment of the Senator from Minnesota spreads it around a bit more effectively.

Mr. MONDALE. I thank the Senator from Rhode Island, and I concur enthusiastically in the observation he has made.

Mr. President, I shall be returning shortly to the third amendment I am going to offer to give this measure national direction. However, at this point I wish to return to my first amendment, which is designed to deal with the problem of school districts that use public buildings, school buses, faculties, curriculum, and other property and assets to support privately segregated academies, as they are called, which are springing up in many parts of the country as the answer to court-ordered desegregation. These academies are all white. Some of them, according to the testimony, have been the recipients of public school buildings which have been sold to them at token prices—in some cases \$10 and \$15—and some of them have used and are using public school buses. Some of them have had public textbooks loaned to them. In one case, the NEA reported a peculiar arrangement was developed which had the effect of lending publicly salaried faculty members to privately segregated academies.

Obviously, if this kind of circumvention and escape from duly issued court orders is permitted, or if we have a system by which public moneys directly or indirectly end up supporting privately segregated educational institutions, the goal of the country for quality education will be frustrated.

For this reason, I have proposed the amendment which I now send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The bill clerk read as follows:

On page 13, line 2, insert before the period a colon and the following: "Provided further, That no part of the funds contained in this appropriation shall be used to assist a school district which, has engaged in the gift, lease, or sale of real or personal property, or services, to a nonpublic elementary or secondary school or school system practicing discrimination on the basis of race, color, or national origin."

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I call up for myself, Mr. CASE, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. BAYH, Mr. BROOKE, Mr. PELL, Mr. MUSKIE, Mr. CRANSTON, Mr. HART, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. RIBICOFF, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, Mr. MCGEE, Mr. YOUNG of Ohio, Mr. GOODELL, Mr. SCHWEIKER, Mr. NELSON, Mr. HARRIS, and Mr. EAGLETON a revision of amendment No. 702 to H.R. 17399, second supplemental appropriations bill.

This bill, which was reported by the Appropriations Committee on June 8, contains the \$150 million that the administration seeks under existing legislative authority to assist school desegregation this summer and throughout the 1970-71 school year.

These funds represent the initial portion of the President's desegregation proposal. They would be added to the following programs: Part D of the Educational Professions Development Act, the Cooperative Research Act, title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, sections 402 and 807 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, and title II of the Economic Opportunity Act. The administration will request additional funds under its proposed Emergency School Aid Act of 1970 following congressional action on the bill.

Amendment No. 702 as revised would prohibit assistance under this appropriation to school districts which have transferred property, services or equipment to nonpublic schools that practice discrimination on the basis of race, color or national origin. This amendment seeks to prevent indirect Federal subsidies of private segregated academies in cases, such as those described in a report by the National Education Association, where a "public school, opened in 1947, was declared surplus by school officials in June 1969 and sold to an individual, using sealed bids, for \$1,500, and team members learned that the purchaser, in turn, sold it to a private group for \$10,"—where "former public school buses, also declared surplus and put up for bid, have been obtained and are now being used to transport the students to the school"—where "localities 'surplus' public school furniture has been sold to private schools," or where "some equipment purchased with title I funds disappeared from the public school in one country."

Amendment No. 702, like amendment No. 703 which I will call up shortly, is designed to clarify and make explicit existing authority and responsibility vested in the Secretary of HEW to prevent funds under this appropriation from being granted to schools and school districts that are practicing a form of token desegregation or paper compliance while discriminating within schools.

Unfortunately, there are numerous ex-

amples of ways in which the desegregation process is being abused and distorted. The Select Committee on Equal Educational Opportunity has received testimony from several individuals and organizations documenting the existence of token or paper compliance with desegregation requirements. For instance, we have learned about desegregated schools which:

Retain totally segregated classes;

Are still operating under illegal freedom of choice plans;

Are transferring their facilities and equipment to private segregated academies;

Are in districts which have reduced the level of local or state financial aid for schools when desegregation has occurred in order to ease the financial burden of parents whose children attend these segregated academies;

Have discriminatorily fired or demoted black faculty;

Have segregated extracurricular activities including, for example, the exclusion of Negroes from organized athletics, student government, proms, dances, cheerleading, or have operated separate and overlapping bus routes for blacks and whites;

Or in other ways have abused and circumvented the goal or quality integrated education.

The Select Committee on Equal Educational Opportunity has heard, for example, about cases in which the students are segregated within "desegregated" schools, in one high school white students were housed in one wing of the building, black students in another. This "desegregated" school has staggered and segregated lunch periods, and a dual system of bells so that whites and blacks do not come into contact in the corridors between classes. We have heard of another "desegregated" school in which black students are taught in segregated classrooms by black teachers, and in which high school commencement exercises were segregated, with white and black students seated on opposite sides of the football field and blacks receiving their degrees from a recently fired black principal, rather than from the white school superintendent.

In my judgment, it is absolutely essential that schools such as the two I have described, or schools which are abusing the desegregation process in any of the ways I listed above, are prohibited from receiving funds under this appropriation. I am personally convinced that under the 14th amendment, and title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare already has the authority and responsibility to prohibit Federal funding of schools or school districts which are practicing any of the kinds of discrimination I have described. I am pleased that Secretary Finch, and Mr. Stanley Pottinger, Director of the Office of Civil Rights in HEW, share this view. During a recent joint hearing of the Education Subcommittee and the Select Committee on Equal Educational Opportunity, I read this same list of abuses to Secretary Finch and asked him if districts en-

gaging in this token and misleading form of "desegregation" would be entitled to the assistance under this appropriations or under the proposed Emergency School Aid Act of 1970. The Secretary responded that "under no circumstances" will districts abusing the desegregation process through mere technical or cosmetic compliance receive funding. He said, and I quote:

We, under no circumstances, will fund districts out of compliance with Title VI, those who fire or demote anyone on the basis of race or with segregated classrooms, or with other basic things that you have mentioned.

I respect and support the existing authority which prohibits Federal funding to districts practicing the kinds of racial discrimination I have listed, and I heartily congratulate the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, for his commitment and promise to assure that no districts abusing the desegregation process in these or other ways will receive funding under this appropriation. There may be disagreement on the part of some observers, however, about whether title VI or the 14th amendment reach the specific abuses concerning assistance to private segregated academies or the supplanting of State and local funds.

We have introduced amendments No. 702 and 703 in order to remove any such ambiguity. These amendments are specifically designed to clarify and make explicit the authority of the Secretary to fulfill his commitment in those cases where desegregation abuses involve direct support of private segregated academies or the supplanting or reduction of State and local aid for public schools. We have not introduced amendments to cover each of the other specific examples of the abuses because there is no doubt that the 14th amendment and title VI of the Civil Rights Act already prohibit funding of districts practicing these abuses.

I hope these amendments will be adopted. I think they represent the minimum necessary to help assure that the \$150 million supplemental appropriations for desegregation is used properly.

But even with the adoption of these amendments, I am still extremely skeptical about whether this emergency appropriation can and will be spent properly and effectively. I am skeptical for several reasons.

First, while I have read the administration's justification of this request, and the committee report describing it, I am not convinced that an adequate case has been made to support the need for these funds. The committee report states that this money is sought "to meet the additional costs" of desegregation. Yet a number of witnesses before the Select Committee on Equal Educational Opportunity have stated that the elimination of the dual school system often saves money rather than costs money because it frequently reduces the extent of busing and offers the advantages of economies realized from the unified system. While I believe that funds can be used creatively to improve the quality of education in an

integrated environment, I am not at all sure that this appropriations request has either identified or limited the use of funds to these creative and useful activities.

Second, I am extremely concerned about where this money is coming from. As I understand it, this \$150 million request is the initial portion of the \$500 million the President is committed to seek to assist school desegregation in the school year 1971. The other \$350 million for fiscal year 1971 and the entire \$1 billion for fiscal year 1972 are to be sought under the proposed Emergency School Aid Act of 1970. What concerns me is the President's initial statement in which he described the source of these initial funds. In his March 24 statement on desegregation the President said:

I shall ask Congress to divert \$500 million from my previous request for other domestic problems for fiscal year 1971.

I am concerned that this \$150 million may be diverted or reprogramed from other equally essential domestic programs, such as Headstart, food stamps, welfare reform, legal services, or needed education programs.

Third, I am skeptical about whether a program of this magnitude can be effectively mounted and implemented in such a short period of time. How can \$150 million be allocated effectively during the months of July, August and September, when specific guidelines do not yet exist, when personnel will need to be attracted and trained, and when nearly 1,000 separate school districts will be eligible for assistance? HEW was quite candid about the difficulties of this administrative task in presenting its justification for the \$150 million supplemental appropriations to the Appropriations Committee. It indicated, for example, that \$2.1 million and 100 positions are required to administer this program. HEW said further that—

This new effort will require: developing entirely new procedures and regulations which will allow the Office of Education to administer a unified coordinated program within the six separate authorities under which funds are being requested. This will include notices to potential grantees of the terms and conditions under which grants will be available, unified application forms, regular notices in the Federal Register, and review approval or award of accounting procedures.

I wonder if these and other tasks can be accomplished effectively in 3 months.

Fourth, despite the Secretary's significant and sincere commitments, and despite, hopefully, the adoption of these amendments, I am extremely concerned about the possibility that portions of this money will still be made available to school districts which will abuse the desegregation process.

We have become painfully aware of the abuses which are now taking place in some "desegregated schools"—such as segregated classrooms, dismissal and demotion of black faculty members, and the other examples I listed earlier—despite the fact that title VI of the Civil Rights Act clearly prohibits Federal assistance to school districts practicing this kind of

token or technical compliance. In short, since HEW and the Department of Justice are not now effectively enforcing existing prohibitions against these abuses, I remain very skeptical about the prospect that they will be able to prohibit funds under this new appropriation from going to districts engaging in this kind of paper compliance. My skepticism is increased by the fact that no part of this \$150 million emergency appropriation for desegregation is provided to increase the enforcement capability of the Office for Civil Rights in HEW.

Fifth, I am concerned about this appropriations request because it appears to represent legislation on an appropriations bill. By dealing with contingencies, and placing additional burdens on the executive agencies which will administer this program, I fear that this request represents legislation on an appropriations bill. I am concerned about this question not only because I am opposed to the idea of legislating on an appropriations bill, but also because this form of legislation makes it extremely difficult, if not impossible, to write in the necessary kinds of administrative and policy safeguards and criteria that are essential for such a new and large program.

For these and other reasons, I remain skeptical about this appropriation. Despite the skepticism, I am willing, on balance, to give the administration a chance to provide these funds fairly and properly to assist districts which are desegregating their schools. If these amendments are adopted, I will support this appropriations request in an effort to give the Secretary an opportunity to deliver on his commitments and prevent funding of districts engaged in paper compliance.

I will, however, be watching very closely to see exactly how these funds are spent. The manner in which these funds are distributed, and the purposes to which they are spent, will influence the position I take in regard to the administration's proposed Emergency School Aid Act of 1970.

I hope that these amendments, coupled with the administration's commitment to prevent abuses, can help assure that the funds under this appropriation are granted to districts that are making honest efforts to desegregate their schools under legal requirement, regardless of their location. I hope that they will help assure that the funds are distributed equitably and among districts with legitimate needs. I hope that they can help prevent a Federal subsidy of paper compliance.

I am pleased to announce that the administration supports these amendments and that the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights supports them as necessary to assure the \$150 million appropriation is used properly. The National Education Association has also endorsed these amendments.

I ask unanimous consent that copies of the amendments Nos. 703, 704, and a copy of the letter from Secretary Finch be printed at this point.

There being no objection, the amendments and the letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMENDMENT No. 703

On page 15, line 2, insert before the period a colon and the following: "Provided further, That no part of the funds contained in this appropriation shall be used to supplant funding from non-Federal sources, which has been reduced as the result of desegregation or the availability of funding under this section."

AMENDMENT No. 704

On page 15, line 2, insert before the period a colon and the following: "Provided further, That no part of the funds contained in this appropriation shall be made available to carry out any program or activity under any policy, procedure, or practice denying funds to any school district legally required to desegregate schools, on the basis of geography or the source of the legal requirement."

THE SECRETARY OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
Washington, D.C.

HON. WALTER F. MONDALE,
U. S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: This is in response to your request for the Department's views on the proposed amendments 702, 703 and 704 to the Second Supplemental Appropriations Bill.

These amendments refer to the appropriation of \$150 million included in the Bill for emergency assistance to desegregating school systems.

Amendment No. 702 provides that no funds may be extended to school districts which have transferred property or services to private schools that practice discrimination on the basis of race, color, or national origin.

Amendment No. 703 prohibits the use of appropriated funds to supplant funding from non-Federal sources which has been reduced as a result of desegregation. Also, the amendment provides that assistance under the appropriation could only be used to supplement State and local funds which would otherwise be made available to support educational programs in the affected school districts.

Amendment No. 704 would make clear that any school district in the process of implementing a Federal court order for desegregation would be eligible for assistance under the appropriation. In addition, school districts desegregating pursuant to a State court order would be eligible for assistance providing that such orders are being implemented and that as a minimum they provide for the elimination of practices prohibited under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

The Department believes that the amendments are consistent with the purpose of the appropriation, which is to assist school districts meet their responsibilities under the law.

With kind regards, I am
Sincerely,

ROBERT H. FINCH,
Secretary.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, at this point I yield to the cosponsor of the proposed legislation, the distinguished Senator from New Jersey who was instrumental in the development of this amendment.

Mr. CASE. I thank my colleague, the Senator from Minnesota. I am indeed very happy to join him and other colleagues in this amendment and two others which will follow on the same general subject.

These amendments are the result of concern that the other sponsors and I have about abuses which are possible if the money provided in this bill for school desegregation is not dispensed with great care.

The administration has asked for inclusion in this bill of \$150 million to assist local school districts to carry out their desegregation plans.

Secretary Finch of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, when he testified recently before a joint hearing of the Education Subcommittee and the Select Committee on Equal Educational Opportunity, assured the Senate the "under no circumstances" will these funds be used to assist districts which are in mere technical compliance with the law or which otherwise abuse the intent of the law.

The three amendments we have introduced propose to provide the Secretary with explicit authority to fulfill this commitment.

Past experience with civil rights legislation shows that the administration's task is made more difficult and delays are encountered when the Secretary's authority is not explicitly stated in the law. It is the intent of these amendments to avoid confusion over the intent of Congress in making these funds available to assist school districts throughout the Nation attain quality integrated education.

In response to my request for the Department's views on these amendments, Secretary Finch said they are "consistent with the purpose of the appropriation, which is to assist school districts to meet their responsibilities under the law."

While these amendments do not deal with all possible areas of abuse, they cover those that most readily come to mind. It is within the discretion of the Secretary to handle others and I am confident that he will do so. However, we will watch closely the development of this program and will bolster the legislative authority of the Secretary should this become necessary.

What specifically would these amendments do?

Amendment 702 provides that no funds may be extended to school districts which have transferred property or services to private schools that practice discrimination on the basis of race, color or national origin.

This amendment seeks to prevent the money provided in this bill from being used to support abuses such as one described in a recent report by the National Education Association. The NEA described one situation in which a public school was declared surplus by school officials in June 1969, and sold to an individual, using sealed bids, for \$1,500. The purchaser, in turn, sold the school to a private group for \$10 and it then was turned into a private segregated school.

Our amendment would make it clear that school districts which have engaged in this type of practice are not entitled to seek assistance under the programs which will be funded under this bill.

Amendment 703 prohibits the use of funds appropriated under this bill to

supplant funds from non-Federal sources which has been reduced as a result of desegregation.

It is the intent of this amendment to require that the funds contained in this bill will be used only to supplement State and local funds which would otherwise be made available to support education programs in the affected school districts.

Amendment 704 would make clear that any school district in the process of desegregating under a legal requirement—wherever the district is located and regardless of whether the requirement is imposed by State or Federal law—would be eligible for assistance under this appropriation so long as its desegregation plan is being implemented and meets the requirements of title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 at a minimum.

The administration originally testified that assistance provided under this appropriation would be available only to school districts in the 17 Southern and Border States. We believe that any school district which is desegregating according to the standards of Federal law should be eligible to receive assistance.

Mr. MONDALE. I thank the Senator for his continued leadership in this matter. I know of no other Member of the Senate who has worked with more dedication toward the achievement of a quality integrated society than the Senator from New Jersey and, as always, I am proud to join him in this proposal.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, as a sponsor of amendments 702, 703, and 704, I feel that their adoption is important if the Senate is serious about giving effective aid to desegregation efforts with the \$150 million requested in this supplemental appropriations. For the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare should understand that Congress expects it to vigorously prohibit misuse of desegregation funds—including the abuses mentioned in these amendments and other familiar abuses carried out in the name of desegregation.

Amendment 702 would prohibit funds to schools which this year have sold or leased property, equipment, or services to segregated private academies. Amendment 703 would prohibit funds to schools which would use them to supplant State and local money which would otherwise be available. And amendment 704 would insure that desegregation funds would be potentially open to all schools legally compelled to desegregate—whether by Federal or State order, or Federal or State law.

Certainly I support giving Federal assistance to schools which are genuinely desegregating. In 1966 I myself introduced legislation which would have authorized Federal expenditures for this very purpose.

I have several reservations however, about this \$150 million appropriation.

First, as a member of the authorizing committee, I am disturbed by this legislating on an appropriation bill. The Subcommittee on Education has recently been conducting hearings on the whole question of desegregation assistance. We are working on legislation, and trying to do a thorough and responsible job.

But instead, Congress is now being asked to just appropriate \$150 million at the last minute, in a rush, before we even act on authorization.

Second, I have serious doubts whether the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—or anyone else—can set up the administrative machinery to handle these funds quickly and well. They must hire and train staff. They must develop procedures for screening, filing, and monitoring applications. They must set up a whole new administrative operation for a brand new program. Yet they are expected to complete the main part of the job, the obligating of funds, by the end of September.

Third, I am extremely concerned about the potential for abuse. Testimony before the Select Committee on Equal Educational Opportunity, numerous reports I have seen and persons I have talked with indicate the whole range of abuses which have occurred in supposedly desegregating school districts. To cite some examples, there are cases where:

Schools are desegregated but blacks are kept in segregated classes, segregated cafeterias, segregated buses.

Blacks are excluded from extracurricular activities.

Well-constructed, modern black schools are closed as an alternative to sending white students there.

Mobile or portable classrooms are used to supplant good black schools which are closed.

Tax deductions are given to parents who take their children out of desegregating schools and send them to all-white private academies.

Black teachers, principals or administrators are demoted or fired while less qualified whites are kept.

Schools are operated under an old freedom of choice plan which has not been updated or revised under court order.

The list goes on and on. And it includes discrimination against Indian-Americans, Mexican-Americans, Eskimos, and other minorities as well.

Amendments 702 and 703 mention two such abuses. It is my understanding that they are prohibited by title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which clearly states that "no person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance." These amendments make the matter clear in these two cases. And further amendments to cover other abuses are unnecessary, because there is general agreement that title VI already prohibits them also.

I support the \$150 million with the understanding that full legal action will be taken when funds are illegally misused, including:

Bringing school boards to court for contempt action;

Suing for the restitution of misused funds;

Criminal suits under the Federal false statements statute, and other appropriate Federal laws.

If we have learned anything from our experience with title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, it is that we must make vigorous, thorough, Federal monitoring efforts—right from the start—if the money is to be spent as intended by Congress.

Amendment 704—which makes assistance with the \$150 million available to all school districts which are under legal compulsion to desegregate—recognizes that the burden of forced desegregation is equally heavy no matter what the source of the requirement.

I myself favor broader expenditure of funds to include schools which voluntarily undertake to desegregate. They may have just as many burdens and may need the Federal assistance just as badly.

Mr. President, I am willing to take a chance if we write in some safeguards. I think that the last minute, unauthorized \$150 million in a supplemental appropriation is a poor way to take legislative action, but I recognize that the problem is pressing and immediate. I am not optimistic that the rushed appropriation and hurried program will be effective, but we must take a first step.

In this context, the protections spelled out in these amendments—and guaranteed under title VI—are essential. I urge adoption of all three amendments.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me on one point?

Mr. MONDALE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, may we have order? I believe every Member in the Chamber would be interested in this colloquy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

The Senator from Mississippi may proceed.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I appreciate the Senator yielding to me.

I direct attention to lines 4 and 5 of the present amendment, the words "subsequent to the beginning of the 1969-1970 school year."

Mr. MONDALE. If I may interrupt the Senator at that point, I wish to point out that in the amendment I sent to the desk that phrase was stricken. It was stricken for the reason that the Parliamentarian advised us that with that phrase the amendment would be subject to a point of order on the grounds that it is legislation on an appropriations bill.

Mr. STENNIS. Yes.

Mr. MONDALE. Nevertheless, I would expect it might be construed by the administration roughly along the lines of the omitted phrase, but that would be up to the administration.

Mr. STENNIS. What was the Senator's point? The Senator struck out the words "subsequent to the beginning of the 1969-1970 school year." My point was going to be that that is punitive in nature and it is retroactive in application. I was going to ask the Senator if he would not consider that and let his amendment, if it passes, be as of the date it becomes law.

I do not know of any school that has done these acts, but in a year of upheaval, adjustment, and change in the midterm adjustments were made. They were makeshift and they had to do everything they could, whereas they will have

fair notice about this and I do not think it will reoccur.

Mr. MONDALE. I have been advised by the Parliamentarian that any reference of that kind would make the amendment subject to a point of order and that is the reason I struck the phrase which appeared in original amendment No. 702, when I sent it to the desk.

For that reason and also on the merits, I would have trouble accepting that. I concede the fairness of the Senator's statement. The Senator does not want it to apply retroactively.

Mr. STENNIS. That is correct.

Mr. MONDALE. I commend the Senator for that position. My feeling is that transfer of public property for these purposes is so clearly unconstitutional that it would not be unfair to apply the prohibition retroactively from the beginning. I would not be able to accept such a modification and if we did modify it in that manner it would be subject to a point of order.

Mr. STENNIS. What is the Senator's interpretation of his amendment when these words have been stricken out? The Senator said something about the department having certain discretion.

Mr. MONDALE. The amendment would have to be construed by the Department. As it now reads, it provides that—

No part of the funds contained in this appropriation shall be used to assist a school district which has engaged in the gift, lease, or sale of real or personal property, or services, to a nonpublic elementary or secondary school or school system practicing discrimination on the basis of race, color, or national origin.

It would have to stand on its own terms.

Mr. STENNIS. Would not the Senator be willing to let it read, "has engaged subsequent to the passage of this Act" in any of these matters? I would support his amendment if he would modify it that way.

Mr. MONDALE. On the merits, I personally could not accept it, because, as I said earlier, I believe the practice is so obviously unconstitutional, and would have been at the time it occurred, that it would not be unfair to retroactively apply it that way.

For practical purposes, the abuse did not start until last fall, when the Supreme Court issued its decision requiring immediate elimination of de jure segregation, so that its retroactive sweep is only of a limited nature in any event.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator has eliminated the language "subsequent to the beginning of the 1969-70 school year"?

Mr. MONDALE. The Senator is correct. I have eliminated that phrase.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONDALE. I yield.

Mr. BAKER. It is my understanding, from the colloquy, that the language, on lines 4 and 5, "subsequent to the beginning of the 1969-70 school year" has been stricken from the amendment.

Mr. MONDALE. That is correct.

Mr. BAKER. Is my further understanding correct that the reason why it was stricken is that it would create a condition precedent or a situation that

extends into the future as a condition precedent?

Mr. MONDALE. I am not thoroughly familiar with the grounds, except that the Parliamentarian has advised me that that phrase would make the amendment subject to a point of order.

Mr. BAKER. The point I am making is that I wonder if I understood, as the Senator from Mississippi understands is implicit, if the words "subsequent to the beginning of the 1969-70 school year" are eliminated, is it not necessary to conform the rest of the language to that intent by using the conforming language "is engaging" instead of "has engaged in" because otherwise it would be retroactive.

Mr. STENNIS. That is correct.

Mr. BAKER. Would the Senator mind putting that inquiry to the Chair?

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may ask for a quorum call without losing my right to the floor at the conclusion thereof.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I would be willing to modify my amendment to reinstate the deleted phrase which reads "subsequent to the beginning of the 1969-70 school year," if by so doing we could have unanimous consent that that phrase would not be subject to a point of order. That would have the advantage of being retroactive only to the beginning of the past school year, and not running back further than that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the Senator asking unanimous consent that it be in order?

Mr. MONDALE. Perhaps we could have a little colloquy.

I yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, as I said, I know of no particular school that has violated these terms, but to pass a law now to make it retroactive in application is contrary to the American system. It is unfair. Suppose they made a sale, according to the Senator's amendment, and got the money. There is nothing invalid about that. Certainly, we ought not to go back to penalize them. Suppose they got market value? According to the Senator's terms, they would not be eligible for any of this money.

The Senator has a great motive and design, but the way the amendment is written, it is retroactive, without notice, and would apply to the just and the unjust.

Mr. MONDALE. Perhaps I may respond to that statement. I can only repeat the point I made earlier, that the practice of donating school buildings, schoolbuses, textbooks, lending faculty, flowered right after the Supreme Court decided that desegregation of de jure situations must be eliminated immediately.

That is why the proposed amendment originally included the phrase, referring in time to the beginning of the current school year, and prohibited the expenditure of any part of the \$150 million for school districts which had engaged in any of those practices from that time on.

I would be glad to include in the amendment a provision as well, that the sale to which we make reference is a sale for less than value to the school district. In other words, what we are trying to get at is a subsidy—

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, with all deference to the Senator's amendment, I think, being retroactive in application, it would be an ex post facto law, and I object to the modification requested.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONDALE. I yield.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I shall not detain the Senate long on this point, because it is my intention to support the amendment, provided we can arrive at certain modifications to make it fair in its application.

I agree with the Senator that it is a deplorable practice to dispose of school property for discriminatory purposes, as I am sure most of our fellow Senators do.

The modification would delete that section of the amendment in lines 4 and 5 which reads "subsequent to the beginning of the 1969-70 school year" has engaged in the gift, lease, or sale, et cetera. That, in effect, creates an absolute situation where a school district which has done this prior to this time is forever precluded from having Federal assistance under these programs, which seems to be, as the distinguished Senator from Mississippi has stated, retroactive, and certainly, to say the least, unfair.

I would suggest, if the Senator would consider it, that the amendment be modified by striking from lines 4 and 5 the words "subsequent to the beginning of the 1969-70 school year" and also striking the words "has engaged" on line 5 and inserting instead the word "engages," which makes it prospective in effect; and I think, by the example and the colloquy here, this encounter today will serve notice that we do not intend to condone and do not condone any sort of subterfuge of this type.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I have two problems with that. One is this widespread engagement in such practices recently, and the prospective amendment would not reach that problem. Second, I have been advised by the Parliamentarian that such language would be subject to a point of order because it would create a contingency under rule XVI.

For both reasons, I feel prohibited from responding affirmatively to the suggestion of the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so I may put to the Chair a parliamentary inquiry as to the propriety of that proposal?

Mr. MONDALE. I am happy to yield, with the unanimous-consent request that I be recognized following the Chair's response to the parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from Tennessee will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I put this inquiry to the Chair: If amendment No. 702 were modified by striking from line 4, beginning with the word "subsequent" through line 5 ending with the word "engaged" and substituting the word "engages," would the amendment as modified be subject to a point of order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PROXMIER). The Parliamentarian advises the Chair that such an amendment would appear to be in order.

Mr. BAKER. I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield further? I really support the purpose of his amendment. Since the Parliamentarian has advised me that it would not be subject to a point of order, and since I think it accomplishes the Senator's purpose, and I believe there would be no objection to it, I urge that the Senator reconsider accepting that modification.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I still have the problem of dealing with school districts which gave away their school buildings, their schoolbuses, their textbooks, and the rest, in response to the Supreme Court order of last year requiring immediate desegregation. The language proposed by the Senator from Tennessee is prospective, and would not reach those school districts.

Mr. BAKER. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MONDALE. I yield.

Mr. BAKER. I think that practice is deplorable, and I agree with the Senator; but I think the proposal would be subject to a point of order if we, as a part of the legislative branch, tried to spell out under what circumstances a gift was legal or illegal. I think it would be within our rights to make it illegal to do that, and then submit to the judiciary the question of whether or not they did it in an attempt to interfere with desegregation. But if we try to spell it out and say "it is illegal because you did it," it would be subject to a point of order as being unconstitutional. I think there is a way to do it, but I think the judiciary is the proper forum.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I cannot agree with the observation offered by the Senator from Tennessee to this extent: When property was donated by public school systems to private, segregated academies following the decision of the Supreme Court, I think they knew full well what they were doing, and it was to donate public properties to an allegedly private institution for an unconstitutional purpose. I think it would be wrong to come along now and reward such a school district with a payment as proposed under this pending appropriations proposal. I would much prefer that the time frame to which my original amendment made reference could be included, but I was advised by the Parliamentarian that that would be contrary to rule XVI.

At this time, I should like to propound to the Chair a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MONDALE. If my amendment

read exactly the same as amendment 702, containing the phrase "subsequent to the beginning of the 1969-70 school year," would that be subject to a point of order?

Mr. PROXMIRE. It seems to leave a contingency, because there would be an indefinite circumstance, *ad infinitum*.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MONDALE. If the phrase referred to were substituted by a phrase reading "engages or has unlawfully engaged in" would that phrase be subject to a point of order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Parliamentarian suggests that the suggested language be submitted in writing, so the Chair can take it under consideration.

Mr. MONDALE. I would ask the Senator from Tennessee if such language, which, in effect, begs the question of whether an illegal transfer has occurred, would meet his objection.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield there, I think it probably would. I wonder if I might ask unanimous consent that I could ask for a quorum call, without the distinguished Senator from Minnesota losing his right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, as far as I am concerned—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. MONDALE. I yield.

Mr. BAKER. As far as the Senator from Tennessee is concerned, the language suggested by the Senator from Minnesota, as I understood it, is satisfactory. The Senator's language was "engages or has unlawfully engaged in"; is that correct?

Mr. MONDALE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BAKER. It is my understanding that this would be an effort to make the statute prospective by the word "engages" and retroactive, but with a judicial determination by the phrase "unlawfully engaged in." Is that correct?

Mr. MONDALE. I agree with the Senator from Tennessee, except in one respect. A determination would have to be made by the administering agency that the transfer of property that is retrospective was an unlawful one. Otherwise, insofar as the retrospective reach is concerned, it would not apply.

Mr. BAKER. I have no objection to the language.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I modify my amendment to provide after the word "which," on line 4, the words "engages or has unlawfully engaged," and so forth.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be so modified, and the clerk will so state the amendment.

Mr. MONDALE. Before so modifying, I ask for a parliamentary ruling on whether this is consistent and in order under rule XVI.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the opinion of the Chair, it would appear to be in order, as the Senator from Minnesota has proposed to modify it.

The clerk will read the amendment as modified.

The bill clerk read as follows:

On line 5, after the word "has" insert "engages or has".

Mr. MONDALE. "Or has unlawfully engaged."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator send his written amendment to the desk?

Mr. MONDALE. I send it to the desk.

The bill clerk read as follows:

On line 5, after the word "year," which is stricken, insert "engages or", and after the word "has" insert "unlawfully".

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I so modify the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is so modified.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia and Mr. ERVIN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota has the floor. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. CASE. May we ask for the yeas and nays?

Mr. MONDALE. I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Will the Senator yield for a question, first?

Mr. MONDALE. I am glad to yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator withdraw temporarily his request for the yeas and nays?

Mr. MONDALE. Yes.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, with the understanding that he will not lose his right to the floor, so that I might make a parliamentary inquiry?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield for that purpose?

Mr. MONDALE. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if I understand the changes by which the Senator has modified his amendment, the amendment reads as follows: "engages or has unlawfully engaged." Does not the fact that the words "unlawfully engaged" will of necessity, place an additional responsibility upon the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare thereby increase his responsibilities and as a result thereof constitute legislation on an appropriation bill?

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, before the Chair rules, may I make an observa-

tion with respect to the question raised by the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. President, if I could have the attention of the Parliamentarian, I would like to make a comment on the question raised by the Senator from West Virginia, before the Chair rules. I should like the attention of the Presiding Officer and the Parliamentarian.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Parliamentarian will give the Senator from Minnesota his attention, and the Presiding officer will also give the Senator from Minnesota his undivided attention.

Mr. MONDALE. Thank you, Mr. President.

The burden imposed on HEW by amendment 702 as modified is already imposed by title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Therefore, the amendment is not subject to a point of order under rule XVI, paragraph 2, as subjecting the Department to a burden not already imposed by existing law.

This amendment prohibits funding under the emergency appropriation of school districts which have given assistance to racially segregated private schools. The Supreme Court has plainly ruled in the tuition grant cases that assistance by public agencies to private segregated schools is racially discriminatory, in violation of the 14th amendment, and I have shown those authorities to the Parliamentarian. See, e.g., *Poindexter v. Louisiana Financial System Commission*, 296 F. Supp. 686, *aff'd* 393 U.S. 17 (1968); *Brown v. South Carolina State Board of Education*, 296 F. Supp. 199, *aff'd* 393 U.S. 22 (1968).

It is, therefore, also violative of title 6 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which applies to nondiscrimination and applies the 14th amendment to programs receiving Federal financial assistance. *Taylor v. Cohen*, 405 F.2d 277 (4th Cir., *en banc*, 1968).

Therefore, it is my opinion that the amendment is not subject to a point of order under rule XVI.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct. These duties already have been imposed by the law.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, before the Senator asks for the yeas and nays—

Mr. MONDALE. I ask the Presiding Officer whether the yeas and nays have been ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have not been ordered.

Mr. MONDALE. I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Does the Senator want to shut me out from attempting to—

Mr. MONDALE. I deeply apologize to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. The Senator owes me no apology.

Mr. President, the amendment as presently constituted, even with the modification that has already been ordered, would be difficult to enforce, because it is not tied to the disposition of federally funded property, but would apply to any and all property or services.

HEW now has policies and administrative enforcement mechanisms in effect and under development which could carry out the intent of the amendment so far as Federal funds are concerned. But the amendment would prohibit the gift, the lease, or the sale of all property and services whether or not they have been federally funded. In other words, it is all encompassing. It includes all property or services.

In the first place, I think HEW would have difficulty in obtaining reliable information concerning the sale of non-federally funded property or of services. Certainly, an assurance of compliance could be, and probably should be, required; but only a careful auditing of financial transactions and of the use of instructional staff time would reveal the prohibited practices if a school district wished to conceal them.

In view of the fact that this is emergency assistance, with a September 30, 1970, deadline for obligation, it seems to me that this provision would be almost impossible to implement effectively. Therefore, I wonder whether the Senator would be willing to modify his amendment by adding on line 6, following the second comma, after the word "services," the following phrase, "supported by Federal funds." So that it would be confined to those gifts, leases and sale of property and services supported by Federal funds.

Mr. MONDALE. I thank the Senator from West Virginia for that suggestion. However, I must respectfully decline it, for two reasons.

First, it does not impose on additional responsibility upon the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The 14th amendment does not draw any distinction between Federal, State, and local properties. The distinction is between public and private property. Therefore, contrary to the suggestion of the Senator from West Virginia, I do not believe that any additional burden is imposed upon the Department.

Second, I refer specifically to the letter I received today from Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Finch, in which he supports amendment No. 702. Therefore, both in terms of legal theory and the administration's position, I cannot accept the proposal of the Senator from West Virginia. Moreover, if the distinction were drawn on the basis of the source school district property, on whether the source is Federal, State, or local, this distinction would be utterly unadministrable and would subvert and destroy any effort to achieve desegregation. Therefore, I must reluctantly decline the suggestion made by the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

There was not a sufficient second.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, without losing my right to the floor, that there be a quorum call—

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold that request?

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I object.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President I am prepared to vote at this point.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I should like to be heard for 30 seconds.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PROXMIER). The Senator from North Carolina is recognized.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, under this amendment as modified, an integrated school district would be denied Federal funds if it made a sale to a nonracially mixed school even though the sale was to the advantage of the school district.

Is that not going some, even for an effort to continue the reconstruction of the South?

In other words, it would prohibit a district receiving funds appropriated by the bill even if the sale it made was to its advantage.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President; I now call up my amendment at the desk and ask that it be stated by the clerk.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be stated by the clerk first.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MUSKIE). The clerk will state the amendment.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On line 6 of the Mondale amendment, No. 702, after the word "services," insert the words "supported by Federal funds."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota will state it.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, as I understand it, this is a modification proposed by the Senator from West Virginia which would limit the reach of amendment No. 702 only to property, given away by local school districts unlawfully, or in other ways, to private segregated schools, which is owned by the Federal Government and would not include any restrictions on State owned or locally owned public property given to such private segregated organizations. Do I understand that amendment correctly?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. The amendment would place into effect the modification which I had hoped the Senator would accept earlier. The words are, "supported by Federal funds."

As I have indicated, this is emergency assistance with a deadline for obligation of September 30, 1970. It seems to me that this provision as now written would be almost impossible to effectuate. I think it would impose a heavy administrative burden upon the Department of HEW. I feel that these gifts of property, services, and property, should be confined to federally supported—to those properties and services supported by Federal funds.

That is the import of the amendment I have offered to the Senator's amendment and I hope that the Senate will accept my amendment.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from West Virginia if I might have a moment or two to look at the amendment as proposed before voting on it.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Of course. Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from West Virginia a question?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. Let me ask the Senator from West Virginia whether his amendment applies only to the words "or services" in line 6?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. No, sir. It modifies the language of line 5 also.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. As to "gift, lease, or sale of property, and services, supported by Federal funds."

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, will the Senator consent to proposing his amendment not at the point on line 6 as suggested, but at the point on line 4 following the word "district," so that it will refer to "school district" rather than to "gift, lease, or sale of real or personal property, or services"?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. No, because I want to get at the heart of the problem. The Senator's amendment would apply to any property, all property; any services, or all services; and would not be confined to federally funded property and services. I think it should be so confined. That is the purpose of my amendment. I will ask for a vote on this amendment at the appropriate time.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment as offered by the Senator from West Virginia.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, let me simply say this, that the 14th amendment has never drawn a distinction on the basis of which government, Federal, State, or local, has title to property. The 14th amendment reaches all public property. It is that law which entitles—

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I am sorry to interrupt the Senator, but we are not talking about which government has title. We are talking about what kind of property is going to be disposed of.

Mr. MONDALE. That is correct.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. And whether it is federally supported or not.

Mr. MONDALE. The Senator is correct, but the constitutional prohibition prohibits any public property from being given to a privately segregated organization.

That is what the amendment is designed to discourage, by withholding public money under this appropriation to public schools which violate the constitutional prohibition. It does not impose any new responsibility under title VI. It is the law now, as declared by the Supreme Court. It merely makes it clear that the money is not in fact to be turned over. It would be the modification proposed by the Senator from West Virginia that would create a new and difficult technicality which, in my opinion, would greatly encourage the establishment of privately segregated academies, unbelievably, through the use of public prop-

erty and through Federal subsidies. I therefore oppose his amendment.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I repeat, that between now and September 30, 1970, it would be impossible to enforce the amendment as the Senator from Minnesota has offered it. So I think from the standpoint of enforcement alone, my amendment is on solid ground.

I say again that the Senator's amendment would apply to all property, all services. My amendment would confine it to federally supported property and services.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, may I say to the Senator from West Virginia that I think there are very profound problems about administering any of this money in the time frame that is offered. But if we cannot enforce anything as elementary as prohibiting Federal funds to school districts that are giving away some of their funds and property, then I say that we ought not to do it.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I rise to support the amendment of the Senator from West Virginia. It has been said that it would be satisfactory to submit assurance of compliance in regard to this particular section.

That would not quite do the job, because, to be effective at all, it would be necessary to have an auditing of the transactions engaged in by a particular school district.

It is at that point that the objections voiced by the Senator from West Virginia would become pertinent.

Such an audit would be extended. It would be detailed. It would have to take into consideration the records of many of the transactions of the school district itself, the origins of which are not in the possession of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Nor would they be readily available.

There are no procedures to go through such an audit of this kind. If the matter were limited to property obtained in federally supported programs the procedures and records of the Department of HEW could be of substantial help.

From that standpoint, it would seem that limiting the prohibition to property obtained in federally supported programs would be in order. The amendment of the Senator from West Virginia should be approved.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from West Virginia to the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Nevada (Mr. CANNON), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD), the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. GORE), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. HARRIS), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. HARTKE), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. MCCARTHY), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. MCCLELLAN), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. MCINTYRE), the Senator

from Georgia (Mr. RUSSELL), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. TYDINGS), the Senator from Texas (Mr. YARBOROUGH), and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. YOUNG) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that the Senator from Nevada (Mr. BIBLE) is absent on official business.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Nevada (Mr. CANNON), and the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. HARRIS), would each vote "nay."

Mr. GRIFFIN. I announce that the Senator from Colorado (Mr. DOMINICK) and the Senators from Oregon (Mr. HATFIELD and Mr. PACKWOOD) are necessarily absent.

The Senator from South Dakota (Mr. MUNDT) is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. COTTON), and the Senator from Arizona (Mr. GOLDWATER) are detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Oregon (Mr. HATFIELD) would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. MUNDT) is paired with the Senator from Colorado (Mr. DOMINICK). If present and voting, the Senator from South Dakota would vote "yea" and the Senator from Colorado would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 32, nays 48, as follows:

[No. 163 Leg.]

YEAS—32

Allen	Fulbright	Smith, Maine
Allott	Gurney	Smith, Ill.
Bellmon	Hansen	Sparkman
Bennett	Holland	Spong
Byrd, Va.	Hollings	Stennis
Byrd, W. Va.	Hruska	Talmadge
Curtis	Jordan, N.C.	Thurmond
Eastland	Jordan, Idaho	Tower
Ellender	Long	Williams, Del.
Ervin	Murphy	Young, N. Dak.
Fannin	Randolph	

NAYS—48

Aiken	Gravel	Moss
Anderson	Griffin	Muskie
Baker	Hart	Nelson
Bayh	Hughes	Pastore
Boggs	Inouye	Pearson
Brooke	Jackson	Pell
Burdick	Javits	Percy
Case	Magnuson	Prouty
Church	Mansfield	Proxmire
Cook	Mathias	Ribicoff
Cooper	McGee	Saxbe
Cranston	McGovern	Schweiker
Dole	Metcalfe	Scott
Eagleton	Miller	Stevens
Fong	Mondale	Symington
Goodell	Montoya	Williams, N.J.

NOT VOTING—20

Bible	Harris	Mundt
Cannon	Hartke	Packwood
Cotton	Hatfield	Russell
Dodd	Kennedy	Tydings
Dominick	McCarthy	Yarborough
Goldwater	McClellan	Young, Ohio
Gore	McIntyre	

So the amendment of Mr. BYRD of West Virginia to Mr. MONDALE's amendment was rejected.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. CASE. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MONDALE and Mr. ALLOTT addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I understand that the floor manager would agree to a time limitation on the remaining two amendments, following the vote on the recurring amendment.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, speaking for myself, I would be agreeable to a time limitation on each of the remaining two amendments offered by the able Senator.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, would the Senator state his amendments?

Mr. MONDALE. In addition to what I assume will be a final vote on amendment 702 which I offered, there are two other amendments. One amendment would make the \$150 million available nationally to school districts desegregating under legal requirement and not restrict funding to one region of the country. I understand this amendment may have the support or at least the sympathy of the Senator from Mississippi; the second amendment is an amendment which would prohibit the use of money under this appropriation for school districts which supplant those moneys by diverting local funds and using them for other purposes.

Those are the two amendments to which I refer.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, who has the floor?

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I propounded a question to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I answered the question insofar as possible at this time.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, if the majority leader is here, I would like to ask—

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONDALE. I am trying to determine whether we can agree on a time limit, so that our colleagues will know the schedule under which we are operating.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONDALE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. THURMOND. Let me ask first if he will accept this amendment—

Mr. ALLOTT. No, I will not agree to that.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, in an effort to reach an agreement on the remaining two amendments which are going to be offered by the Senator from Minnesota, Nos. 703 and 704, I ask unanimous consent that all time on each amendment and amendments thereto and appeals, with the exception of motions to lay on the table, be limited to 10 minutes to the side, the time to be equally divided between the able Senator from Minnesota—

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I have a very simple amendment, which I think can be disposed of promptly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment

of the Senator from Minnesota as offered.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, what is the pending question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, was the unanimous-consent request objected to?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It was objected to.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Can it be objected to without the Senator's rising and addressing the Chair?

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota.

The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Nevada (Mr. CANNON), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD), the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. GORE), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. HARRIS), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. MCCARTHY), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. MCCLELLAN), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. MCINTYRE), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. RUSSELL), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. TYDINGS), the Senator from Texas (Mr. YARBOROUGH), and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. YOUNG), are necessarily absent.

I further announce that the Senator from Nevada (Mr. BIBLE) is absent on official business.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Nevada (Mr. CANNON), and the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. HARRIS), would each vote "yea."

Mr. GRIFFIN: I announce that the Senator from Colorado (Mr. DOMINICK) and the Senators from Oregon (Mr. HATFIELD) and Mr. PACKWOOD are necessarily absent.

The Senator from South Dakota (Mr. MUNDT) is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Arizona (Mr. GOLDWATER) is detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado (Mr. DOMINICK), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. HATFIELD), and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. MUNDT) would each vote "yea".

The result was announced—yeas 63, nays 19, as follows:

[No. 164 Leg.]

YEAS—63

Aiken	Dole	Jackson
Anderson	Eagleton	Javits
Baker	Fong	Jordan, Idaho
Bayh	Fulbright	Magnuson
Bellmon	Goodell	Mansfield
Boggs	Gravel	Mathias
Brooke	Griffin	McGee
Burdick	Gurney	McGovern
Byrd, W. Va.	Hansen	Metcalfe
Case	Hart	Miller
Church	Hartke	Mondale
Cook	Hruska	Montoya
Cooper	Hughes	Moss
Cranston	Inouye	Murphy

Muskie	Proxmire	Smith, Ill.
Nelson	Randolph	Spong
Pastore	Ribicoff	Stevens
Pearson	Saxbe	Symington
Pell	Schweiker	Williams, N.J.
Percy	Scott	Williams, Del.
Prouty	Smith, Maine	Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—19

Allen	Ellender	Sparkman
Allott	Ervin	Stennis
Bennett	Fannin	Talmadge
Byrd, Va.	Holland	Thurmond
Cotton	Hollings	Tower
Curtis	Jordan, N.C.	
Eastland	Long	

NOT VOTING—18

Bible	Harris	Mundt
Cannon	Hatfield	Packwood
Dodd	Kennedy	Russell
Dominick	McCarthy	Tydings
Goldwater	McClellan	Yarborough
Gore	McIntyre	Young, Ohio

So Mr. MONDALE's amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CASE. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me for the purpose of making a point of order?

Mr. MONDALE. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Mississippi for that purpose.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator. Mr. President, I direct the attention of the Chair now to page 14, line 7, and on through lines 1 and 2 on page 15.

When the debate started, I made inquiry about the authorization for this amount of money, Mr. President, but I have learned since then that this authorization really is taken from several authorization acts that are listed on page 14, beginning with the Education Professions Development Act, the Higher Education Act of 1965, the Cooperative Research Act, title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, section 807 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, section 402 of the elementary and secondary education amendments of 1967, and the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, on down through line 17 and including the figure "\$150,000,000" on line 18, where we find this language: "to remain available until September 30, 1970."

Mr. President, my point of order is that the remaining language in line 18, plus "1970" on line 19, is legislation on an appropriation bill. I repeat those words: "to remain available until September 30, 1970," and the proviso beginning on line 19 down through line 2 on page 15, is legislation in a general appropriation bill. Therefore, I make the point of order, Mr. President, that this is an appropriation that extends beyond existing law—that is, from June 30 until September 30, 1970—and that we have no authorization for this appropriation for the period I have just designated and the effect of the proviso beginning on line 19 is to amend the earmarking in the authorization act.

Just to make sure I have made it clear,

I repeat: I raise the point of order that these words beginning on line 19, page 14 of the bill, are purely legislation on an appropriation bill, and, therefore, I make the point of order that the entire section, beginning on line 7, page 14, down to and through line 2 on page 15, should be stricken from the bill as being legislation on a general appropriation bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MUSKIE). The Chair will state that the point of order is well taken. As advised by the parliamentarian, under the precedents of the Senate, this is obviously legislation on a general appropriation and not in order under rule XVI, paragraph 4.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I am a member of the Committee on Appropriations. I want to say to the Senate that I did not realize that that language was legislation on an appropriation bill during full committee markup.

I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MONDALE. Do I correctly understand that the Chair has just ruled that the section entitled "Office of Education, Emergency School Assistance," appearing on page 14 of the pending bill, starting on line 7 through line 2 of page 15, is subject to the point of order that it is violative of rule XVI?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Rule XVI, paragraph 4.

Mr. MONDALE. Has that point of order been made?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order has been made and sustained that the language on line 18 of page 14 of the bill, "to remain available until September 30, 1970," the provision beginning on line 19 and the language on lines 1 and 2 of page 15 of the bill, "expenses shall remain available until June 30, 1971," is legislation on an appropriation bill, and the point of order is well taken.

Mr. MONDALE. Do I correctly understand, then, that that is no longer a part of the matter now before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's understanding is correct.

Mr. MONDALE. I thank the Chair.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment sponsored by myself and the Senator from Washington (Mr. JACKSON), the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. HRUSKA), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PASTORE), the Senator from Maine (Mr. MUSKIE), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. BOGGS), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. FONG), and the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. COOPER), and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 8, line 5, delete "\$200,000" and insert "\$400,000".

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, may we have order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, if I may have the attention of the Senate, this is a very simple amendment.

After this bill had passed the House, a supplemental estimate was given to the Senate of \$600,000. What we have done in this particular case is to add a small amount in the Senate of \$100,000, which was recommended by the House, and we have forgiven \$200,000 which was to be paid back to the President's emergency fund.

What they need this money for, in very simple language, is to have the money to run their office until the first of the fiscal year, including \$140,000 for a grant to conduct a research project in programs in which the Environmental Quality Council has particular responsibility. So what I have proposed here, which I understand is agreeable to the chairman of the subcommittee, is to appropriate \$140,000 to contract for the monitoring, evaluation, and prediction of environmental factors, air and water pollution, and \$60,000 for the first annual environmental quality report required by the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, which was, as the Presiding Officer well recognizes, S. 1075. So this will simply add \$200,000 to the amount to enable them to get going, and the remainder will be taken care of in the independent offices appropriations.

I believe that the distinguished Senator from West Virginia has agreed to this and is willing to take this amendment.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I have discussed this matter with the able Senator from Colorado, and I am willing to accept the amendment. I believe this also has been discussed with the ranking minority Member.

Mr. ALLOTT. As a matter of fact, the distinguished Senator from Nebraska is a coauthor of the amendment, and he is agreeable.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I am willing to accept the amendment, Mr. President.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I am pleased to support the amendment under consideration to add \$200,000 to the supplemental appropriation for the Council on Environmental Quality and the Office of Environmental Quality.

As the author of the act creating the office and as a supporter of the act creating the Council, I know the necessity of these additional funds. The intent of the Congress in creating both the Office and the Council was to provide a viable organization to guide our efforts to improve the quality of the environment. One of the first and most important tasks facing the Office and the Council is the assessment of data presently available that indicate the state of our environment. All the efforts of the Council and the Office, for the next several years depend on this assessment.

The birth of an important new organization is no time to subject it to financial malnutrition. This is a small but important step in the preservation and enhancement of our natural resources.

I urge Senators to support the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BOGGS, Mr. BENNETT, and Mr. BYRD of West Virginia moved to lay the motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 699

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I call up my amendment number 699 for myself and for Mr. BAYH, Mr. BROOKE, Mr. CASE, Mr. CRANSTON, Mr. GOODELL, Mr. HART, Mr. HATFIELD, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MONDALE, Mr. MUSKIE, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PACKWOOD, Mr. PELL, Mr. SCOTT, and Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 12, line 8, strike out "\$50,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$100,000,000".

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment. The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I shall be very brief. I promised the majority leader that I would be brief. This situation can be pictured very quickly.

Under my amendment a total supplemental appropriation in the amount of \$100 million would be provided for Neighborhood Youth Corps summer programs, rather than the \$50 million supplemental appropriation recommended by the Appropriation Committee.

The United States Conference of Mayors has reported that if funds were made available the Nation's cities require and could effectively provide 227,173 additional opportunities for youths between 14 and 21 years of age in the Neighborhood Youth Corps programs, to supplement to the 330,000 opportunities which will be available under the \$147,900,000 appropriated for the program under the Labor-HEW Appropriations bill for fiscal year 1970.

The conference reported that in the Nation's 50 largest cities alone an additional 165,298 slots can effectively be used. For example, in New York City more than 37,081 additional positions over and above the 25,419 now proposed, could be put to effective use this summer.

At this year's cost of \$445 per opportunity, a total supplemental appropriation of \$100 million is required to meet this need.

Mr. President, we are in a grave situation on the question of youth unemployment this summer. The administration recognizes it; everybody recognizes it. The question is, what should we do about it? The dimensions of the problem are indicated by the fact that the administration itself has specified enough money for 893,000 job opportunities. The market to be filled is 1,700,000. I ask unanimous consent that a letter to that effect from the Department of Labor, dated June 18, 1970, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
Washington, D.C., June 15, 1970.

Hon. JACOB K. JAVITS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR JAVITS: This relates to your conversation with Joe Pichler regarding the estimate of 1.7 million as the current "universe of need" for youth manpower programs.

The estimate is based on the March 1968 CPS survey which found 2.7 million poor 16 through 21-year-olds. The downward adjustment takes account of the subsequent overall decline in the poor population, of the relatively small proportion of women in this age group whose major activity is keeping house, and of the component who, although poor, work year-round.

The estimate relates to 16 through 21-year-olds, since, as you know, this is primarily the age group served by Job Corps and Neighborhood Youth Corps. It is important to note, however, that in planning our youth programs we must keep in mind the capabilities of existing sponsors to effectively provide manpower services as well as the "universe of need."

Sincerely,

ARNOLD R. WEBER,
Assistant Secretary for Manpower.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the 893,000 job opportunities indicated by the administrator, for which \$671.8 million is provided, compares with 837,000 job opportunities made available last year with total funding of \$617.8 million. That would look like an increase of \$54 million in money and an increase of 56,000 opportunities over last year.

The difficulty with these figures is that the level of jobs announced by the administration omits two factors: First, it omits the extent to which the National Alliance of Businessmen will hire youths this year as contrasted with last year. This is the voluntary organization of business leaders which is responsible for a major part of the youth employment program during the summer. Last year they hired 192,000. This year they have pledged for only 100,000.

Mr. President, so that there may be no question about it, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from the National Alliance of Businessmen dated today, in which they make this statement:

As of June 19, 1970, NAB's metro offices had received firm offers from private employers for approximately 100,000 summer jobs for disadvantaged youth.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL ALLIANCE OF BUSINESSMEN,
Washington, D.C., June 22, 1970.

Hon. JACOB JAVITS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. JAVITS: We are happy to respond to your request for a report on the current status of the National Alliance of Businessmen's efforts to find jobs for disadvantaged young people this summer.

As of June 19, 1970, NAB's metro offices had received firm offers from private employers for approximately 100,000 summer jobs for disadvantaged youth.

Our metro offices are continuing their efforts to find additional job opportunities for

disadvantaged young people this summer. Several large cities have not yet submitted pledge results of their Summer '70 campaign.

Sincerely yours,

RICHARD E. HAAS,
Vice President, Operations.

Mr. JAVITS. Accordingly, we have a shortfall of 92,000 jobs coming out of private business according to the statement I have just asked to have printed in the RECORD.

The second factor is the twofold situation which surrounds employment this year as contrasted with last year.

In the first place, the target market for summer youth employment has increased from 1,500,000 last year to 1,700,000 for this summer—an increase of 14 percent. The reason that we have this situation is that a small increase in average unemployment in the United States represents a major increase among the youth in our cities because the nature of the youth to be reached by this summer employment program represents a major increase in the kind of unemployment from which the ghetto and slum children suffer.

I emphasize, notwithstanding the statement made in the committee report, that the benefit of an increased appropriation will go especially to the 100 larger cities; that there is absolutely no idea of any kind, in my mind; there is nothing in the law or in the legislation, which does anything to inhibit problems of rural unemployment, or unemployment in the small towns. I assume, as they have before, that the Department of Labor will apportion the slots based upon their overall judgment as to the total unemployment for youth, no matter where they come from, the urban areas, the small towns, or the large towns.

However, speaking for the largest city in the country, I want to be the first to affirm that that is the way it is and that is the way it will be.

Mr. AIKEN. Will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I want to thank the Senator from New York for making it clear that there is nothing in the proviso that is intended to discriminate against the small cities in the rural areas of the country.

I would like to ask him one additional question: What ages would youth be eligible to take advantage of this program?

Mr. JAVITS. Fourteen to twenty-one.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator is sure of that? It is not 16 to 18?

Mr. JAVITS. Fourteen to twenty-one. This is the Neighborhood Youth Corps summer program and it covers the age group 14 to 21.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the Senator from New York twice.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank my colleague very much.

It is only fair to pay a special tribute to the distinguished Senator from West Virginia (Mr. BYRD). He was most forthcoming in recognizing the need here. He cannot be faulted for the way in which the bill comes to the Senate floor. So far as he was concerned, he has done nothing but his manifest duty. He had a request from the Department of Labor that

they could use a given number of additional slots, 80,000 to be exact, and he met that request to the letter. He could do no more. What else can be done depends on the Senate, because the administration has come to him and made representations to him and he is bound by that.

The case, in my judgment, becomes one of policy because we want to meet the needs which are represented to us, or as nearly as we can, by the mayors of the country; nor will we rest content with the estimates of the administration which were made in balancing the many financial factors, and the incendiary city factors.

The Senator from West Virginia (Mr. BYRD)—and we can pay him any tribute we can think of and it will be deserved—has done all he can. The rest is up to the Senate.

The mayors of this country certify to us that they, too, feel that we should effectively and adequately fill the 227,173 job slots for the purposes of giving necessary opportunities for the needs of the youths in a particular community. Again, I cite examples which indicate that it is not just a matter of the big cities alone. To give my colleagues a few examples:

In Little Rock, Ark., 200 additional slots.

In New Haven, Conn., 550.

In Des Moines, Iowa, 100.

In Charleston, S.C., 300.

They give other figures for larger cities but it is certainly clear that every effort is being made to reach all the cities in the country.

Thus, Mr. President, the question is this: Will the Senate, in its wisdom—looking at the job market for this particular purpose of 1,700,000 youths, in the face of the increased unemployment bulge with youth especially hard hit and, as I pointed out, with unemployment going up in poverty areas from something like 20.9 percent to almost one-third or 32.7 percent—will the Senate exercise its wisdom and judgment and its discretion and add \$50 million to what has been recommended by the committee?

Again I repeat, the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. BYRD) has done everything that anyone could possibly do to help in this situation.

Now, will the Senate add the \$50 million in order to come as close as it can to meet the problem as placed before us by the mayors of the country?

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Conference of Mayors, indicating the needs, be included in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. CONFERENCE OF MAYORS,
Washington, D.C., May 7, 1970.

Hon. JACOB K. JAVITS,
Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR JAVITS: In response to your request for information, we have made inquiries as to the cities' 1970 needs for the summer Neighborhood Youth Corps slots beyond those allocated to them to date. The information we have received from the fifty largest cities shows that the total number

of additional slots that these cities could effectively utilize this summer is 165,298.

On the basis of our contacts with a sample of the smaller cities, we estimate their need and capacity to utilize additional slots to be approximately 30 percent above their present allocation. This would mean an additional 61,875 slots needed by the smaller cities.

Combining these figures, the present real need for summer 1970 is 227,173 additional slots nation-wide.

I trust that these statistics will be helpful to you in pointing up the critical need for an enlarged appropriation for the summer Neighborhood Youth Corps program.

Sincerely,

JOHN J. GUNTHER,
Executive Director.

I hope that it will. I considered it my duty to present the matter to the Senate.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President—

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. PERCY. Is it true that if we appropriate the \$50 million additional, the Department of Labor would only be required to use the amount it felt could sensibly be used?

Mr. JAVITS. There is no question about that. As a matter of fact, considering the lateness of the hour, I ascertained that very carefully and the department intends to use, if we give them \$100 million, to use \$15 million for recreation, which I think is slightly different from the way the mayors want it, but is intelligent and, indeed, the committee itself thought that was an intelligent way to proceed.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if the Senator from New York would yield right there, he means that \$15 million would be used for recreation?

Mr. JAVITS. No. Of course not. It would be used in support of recreation programs, thus giving additional job slots for the program for youth which would be employed in the recreation program. Absolutely correct.

Now, the second point is that the length of time for individual jobs would be cut to 8½ weeks rather than 10 weeks, and that the \$85 million could be profitably and effectively used for that purpose.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the statement of purpose of the \$15 million, submitted to the committee by the Department of Labor, be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUPPORT PROGRAM FOR SUMMER YOUTH

The \$15,000,000 requested for the Neighborhood Youth Corps Summer Support Program will be administered by the Labor Department in cooperation with the Department of Interior's Bureau of Outdoor Recreation. The funds will provide support for recreation facilities to be provided for approximately 800,000 poverty youth aged 6-13 years. This support will consist of supervisory personnel, transportation, hot lunches, insurance and program supplies to conduct the recreation activities, but will not provide any additional job opportunities for the disadvantaged youth aged 14-21 who will participate in the regular NYC summer program. However, in the regu-

lar program of 80,000 job opportunities for which \$35,000,000 is requested many of these opportunities will be used to provide summer recreation aids and camp counselors for the younger youth.

The "Operation Clean Waters 1970" program referred to in the President's Council on Youth Opportunity Report on 1970 Summer Youth Programs is not a part of the NYC Summer Support Program.

Mr. PERCY. May I ask one additional question: In the studies made on civil disorders in the cities across the country, beginning with Watts 5 years ago, was it quite apparent to the investigators that among those youth who wanted to work and who were frustrated because they could not achieve useful work during the hot summer months, idleness was a contributing factor to the disorders?

Mr. JAVITS. There is no question about that. In addition, let me add—I am aware here of the desire to curtail this discussion and I shall be brief—that where we have learned a lot about the kind of summer jobs, to do what we want done, I think we are profiting from it considerably.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I support the amendment of the distinguished Senator from New York.

Now, Mr. President, the issue that we are currently discussing is related to a program that has been one of the most constructive that we in this Chamber have had the opportunity to be a part of. The Neighborhood Youth Corps summer jobs program, under the direction of the Department of Labor, has provided much needed employment opportunities to many of the youth of this Nation who otherwise would have been unable to find employment in the summer.

The benefits of this program have been many. Invaluable on the job training has been provided to our youth. They have had possibly their first taste of what may turn out to be a lifetime career work. At the same time, this chance to work has provided many with the opportunity to earn needed money of their own which may go for their further education lessening the need for public and private scholarship assistance. By the operation of this program, the Congress has carried out its duty to provide this needed employment and experience to many of our Nation's youth.

This program has also been responsible for giving many young people something constructive to do. Instead of idleness, many young people have had the satisfaction of performing a meaningful job.

So what we are discussing this evening is not the value of this program, for its value has been proven. What we are discussing is how much money could effectively be used in the employment of our young people this summer. In official language, what we are discussing is the number of annual training slots that could be effectively funded. The cost of these slots—which provide for 10 weeks work experience—has risen from \$413 in the summer of 1969 to \$445 for this summer. The Department of Labor has indicated that 76,036 slots could be utilized this summer. This was the result, evidently, of information received through the department's regional offices. However, we know that training costs have

gone up, and that the program is underfunded when compared with last year's appropriations. Even with \$100 million, the program would still fall short of last summer's target group of 1.5 million youths. Thus, there is going to be no significant expansion of the program.

In a study by the Conference of Mayors, it was indicated that 227,173 additional slots could be used nationwide this summer if funds were made available. Chicago, for example, could use more than 19,000 additional slots. If the Conference of Mayor's estimate is correct, the additional money required will be in the neighborhood of \$100 million, which would be provided for by the amendment under consideration.

Before we make our decision on this matter, we should make one more distinction. That is to point out the obvious, that each one of these slots is a young person, looking for something to do this summer. As the senior Senator from New York pointed out in his testimony before the committee, the teenage jobless rate for April was 15.7 percent. But more critically, the unemployment rate among black teenagers during the first quarter of this year was 32.7 percent, approximately one-third.

What this means is that in our large cities, there are going to be a great number of black youths in the ghettos sweating out this summer with nothing to do. As James Farmer of HEW pointed out just the other day, this Nation is poised upon a racial tinderbox that could easily explode this summer. Need I remind anyone that it was just 5 years ago that the riots in Watts occurred, and a very large factor was the fact that there was no useful and constructive work for frustrated youths. This frustration turned to anger, and that anger burst into flames that burned block upon block of Los Angeles and later in many other cities.

Mr. President, as much as anyone in this chamber, I am anxious to see that we do not frivolously appropriate money for useless purposes. I want to see each dollar that we appropriate spent as effectively as possible. However, I do not want to deny to any youth the opportunity of a good and productive job this summer.

It is my understanding that even though the summer has already started, the Department of Labor could effectively use more than just the \$50 million asked for in this program. Thus, I would rather appropriate the additional money needed for this most worthwhile program, firmly believing that the Department of Labor will spend only the amount that it feels it can allocate wisely and effectively.

Mr. President, I believe we should make the extra effort to provide to this underfunded program the additional money that is needed so that as many of our youth as possible will have an opportunity to spend a productive and what I hope will be a cool summer.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, does the Senator from New Hampshire desire me to yield to him at this time?

Mr. COTTON. No. I shall wait and seek the floor in my own right.

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, I rise

to express my very strong support of the amendment, of which I am a cosponsor, submitted by the distinguished Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS), to provide a meaningful level of Neighborhood Youth Corps summer job opportunities for disadvantaged youth this summer. In a time of rapidly rising unemployment, when there is every indication that the terrible unemployment rates in our inner cities—as high as 43 percent among black youth in central Los Angeles—will continue their strong upward trend for many months, we must insure that the Federal Government will play a truly meaningful role in the provision of summer jobs this year.

The funds which our amendment seeks to add to the second supplemental appropriation bill to H.R. 17399—will bring the total number of NYC job opportunities to be supported in public and private nonprofit organizations to 550,000. That we should meet this target figure seems to me irrefutable, when we realize that even that number of job opportunities will meet the needs of only one-third of the estimated 1.7 million eligible youths this summer.

In my own State of California, these needs can be amply demonstrated. Los Angeles has an estimated 135,000 eligible youths, but will be able to provide only 10,000 jobs with its present allocation of public funds, both Federal and local. The mayor of San Diego, who is president of the National League of Cities, has wired me that present Neighborhood Youth Corps funding is "grossly inadequate," and has estimated the number of disadvantaged 16- to 21-year-old youth in San Diego needing jobs as 11,000. The mayor of San Jose has informed me that of the 5,000 eligible disadvantaged young people, approximately 80 percent will not be able to find work this summer, and the mayors of San Francisco, San Bernardino, and numerous other California cities have expressed similar grave concern.

I congratulate the administration for its initiative in requesting the additional \$50 million contained in H.R. 17399, of which \$35 million is intended for the Neighborhood Youth Corps summer job program. I strongly believe, however, that the need for the additional \$50 million which would be added by the amendment now before us can hardly be overstated.

We might not be in this situation if the economy were stronger and private industry were able to play a greater part in the total summer job program. However, the private sector finds itself in the doubly unfortunate position of having no job to offer the son who has just seen his father laid off.

Even the goal of 192,000 summer hires through the National Alliance of Businessmen had been only 45 percent pledged as of May 31. That means industry may be providing as few as 86,000 jobs to disadvantaged youths this summer, and in that situation—brought on by the administration's fiscal and monetary policies for fighting inflation—the Federal Government has an obligation to move in a significant way to take up the slack.

Otherwise, the already great frustra-

tion in our inner city ghettos may well result in a volatile and explosive situation in the heat of the summer if adequate work, recreation and cultural activities are not available for young people. The basic conditions of poverty, unequal opportunity and hopelessness which have permeated the inner cities continue to exist. Although some progress has been made in alleviating these intolerable conditions, the record of this administration over the last year and a half has indicated a highly questionable and vacillating commitment—at best—to fight against these conditions. That many leaders of civil rights and poverty organizations and communities see the administration as being indifferent to their problems tends to further exacerbate an already tenuous and dangerous situation.

The comparatively small amount of extra money we are seeking—\$50 million—offers a very tangible and symbolic way of saying to our young and our disadvantaged that we are willing to commit needed resources to offer them a real opportunity within the system. To turn away from this urgent need for further Federal support for summer jobs is to turn our backs on the aspirations of many young men and women in our poverty communities. Such disregard can serve only to strengthen the efforts of those who decry the lack of responsiveness of the system and advocate its overthrow.

This point is eloquently made in the following quotations which were made by disadvantaged youngsters who attended a youth rally on June 13 in the Los Angeles Board of Supervisors hearing room:

Christopher Campbell of Long Beach: "In 6 days more than $\frac{3}{4}$ of a million teenagers will be on the streets. Of these, 135,000 are in the poverty level. The outlook is bleak. There are only about 10 or 11,000 federal jobs. There is a need. I guess the government has something more important to do than get jobs for youth. But there is nothing more important. The proposed 50 million for youth will mean more jobs and opportunities but it won't be enough. The trend today is to go into the streets, but this meeting shows that appeals can be made to our government through peaceful means. We have shown we care . . . I say to the Congressmen—will you?"

Chip Atilano of Compton: "We all say the same things. No jobs. We are pleading with the establishment. More jobs. I don't have to repeat. The problem is so bad. I had a year of college and got a job this summer as a ditch digger, but lots of kids didn't get that chance. We plead with you to establish more jobs."

Michael Garrett of Los Angeles: "We are trying to do something in a peaceful way, to get summer jobs for kids. We are here to support our Congressmen and Senators to get us jobs. If we don't get them, many of us won't be able to return to school. With 60,000 adults out of jobs it puts more pressure on us. We are willing and waiting to have our chance in life. The government can't afford to have summers like the past ones. We will do our part. Will you do yours?"

Nancy Carillo of San Pedro: "If there were enough jobs there wouldn't be so much dope and stuff. If we had jobs we would not be looking for stuff to get loaded on. When there aren't enough jobs kids just walk around looking for things to do. If there were jobs, crime and narcotics would go down. Instead of using the money for more officers they would give it for jobs and

they wouldn't need so many officers. A lot of kids if they had jobs wouldn't be in the camps and those other places."

While it is true that some of the work done by NYC summer enrollees has and will continue to be make-work designed to keep out-of-school youths occupied somewhat more constructively than simply walking the streets from morning until night, it is also true that the Neighborhood Youth Corps can provide truly useful job experience and work orientation, as well as a small income which can make a crucial difference to an out-of-school youth. In its May 1, 1970, release on summer jobs, the Department of Labor stressed that its guidelines for the 1970 summer program "emphasize the placing of enrollees in jobs that will broaden their experience and provide an introduction to possible careers or to skills useful in obtaining post-high school employment."

Though we may wish to see more effective, less short-term approaches to the problems of youth unemployment, I believe it is morally indefensible to give up on several hundred thousand disadvantaged youth while we look for those better approaches. In the context of the billions of dollars spent on weapons of destruction, the addition of \$50 million for summer jobs is a small investment to make in opportunity and hope for the youth of our inner cities. I urge my colleagues to make that investment in youth and the stability of our inner cities.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I rise to join in urging the Senate to adopt the urgently needed amendment that is now before us.

Skyrocketing unemployment has hit hardest in our large cities, especially among teenagers. In May, the unemployment rate among teenagers was nearly triple the national average.

City officials from New Jersey have alerted me that they face mammoth problems this summer if idle young people cannot be directed to productive and meaningful pursuits.

In New Jersey, the city of Newark alone requires at least another 9,293 more NYC job slots this summer. Jersey City needs 741.

With the cutback in the Job Corps program, it is doubly important that we adopt this amendment.

The Neighborhood Youth Corps is one of our most demonstrably effective manpower programs. I urge the Senate to give it the support it needs. We cannot be content with halfway measures.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I would be glad to join the distinguished Senator from New York and echo the sentiments expressed by my colleague from California.

I think this is a pressing question. There is a great need. It is something that has to be taken care of immediately because the time is now upon us.

I, of course, in the past have wondered about the possibility of a special classification of jobs for young people. There is great need and with the minimum wage problem facing us, young people cannot possibly earn that amount.

In the absence of anything to rectify that situation, I enthusiastically join the Senator from New York and endorse the amendment he offered and support it.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I shall take only a moment.

The able Senator from New York appeared before the subcommittee and presented the request by the Conference of Mayors for \$100 million.

At that point the subcommittee had received no request from the administration for funds. There was no budget estimate. The able Senator from New York was present and presented information from the Department of Labor which indicated that the Secretary had said that he could feasibly and effectively use \$33.9 million.

When the subcommittee met to mark up the bill, it decided to recommend to the full committee the full amount the Secretary of Labor said he could utilize—the \$33.9 million.

By the time the full committee marked up the bill, the budget estimate had been received from the Bureau of the Budget in the amount of \$50 million. So, the full committee recommended an appropriation of the full amount of the budget estimate.

Mr. President, I think that the able Senator from New York has presented a very fine case. He did an exemplary job before the committee. And I think that he performed a great service, because up to that point we had received no request from anyone for these funds.

Mr. President, I think the importance of continuing the Neighborhood Youth Corps program should be recognized. It was established in 1964 under the Economic Opportunity Act, and since that time—as the manpower report of the President recently transmitted to the Congress notes—more than 2 million young people have benefited by the programs of the NYC since its inception. The summer program, which we are now considering, is one of several important components of the Neighborhood Youth Corps.

It is the Government's principle effort to assist disadvantaged youth. The need is great. More than one-half million teenagers drop out of school each year, and join the ranks of the unemployed. In fact, the unemployment rate for teenagers remains around 13 percent, far above the national average for all workers. Other programs of the NYC, include an "in-school" program which assisted 134,000 young people in fiscal year 1969. This program provided a source of income to those youths, who otherwise would have to work full time to support themselves and their families.

The "out-of-school" program is planned for school dropouts who need work experience and remedial education to successfully enter into the job market. In fiscal year 1969, 120,000 young people were enrolled in this project.

On the average, the participants were 18 years of age, and had completed their sophomore year in high school.

For the 16- and 17-year-olds, the "out-of-school" program will provide inten-

sive prevocational training with both academic and occupational content.

This program is conducted under authority of section 102 of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, and supplements the summer programs delegated to the Department of Labor from the Office of Economic Opportunity. It is administered by the Manpower Administration. The National Alliance of Businessmen assists in locating employment opportunities. This is an admirable example of the benefits which can accrue when Government and business work together for a common goal. I congratulate this organization for its outstanding assistance in finding these jobs in the business community, and hope that the businessmen of our country will continue their meritorious efforts.

The success of this program, for the most part, has been great. Many of the participants were given the opportunity to find personal achievement, and, more important, their own place in society. Others have reported, however, that this program is just another means of public support affording little in the way of meaningful work experience, and having little effect in lowering the school dropout rate. I am glad to note that the President's Council on Youth Opportunity is aware of these problems, and is redefining the approach taken by developing a more individually oriented program, so that the results will be more beneficial both to the participant and to his community.

I salute the Senator from New York for the service he has rendered. I will interpose no objection to the additional \$50 million. We do have to go to conference. It may be well that we have \$100 million when we go to conference.

I would prefer to leave that to the will of the Senate. I will not interpose any objection to the amendment which would increase the amount from \$50 million to \$100 million.

Mr. President, I am ready to vote. I would just as soon have a voice vote. But, of course, the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I have no doubt whatsoever that the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from New York is a very meritorious amendment. And I am perfectly willing to vote for it.

I think it is for an excellent cause. The increasing of appropriations from \$50 million to \$100 million will not break the Government. And the human values involved no doubt justify this action.

Mr. President, I regret that the distinguished Senator from Arkansas is not here. The Senator from New Hampshire just cannot refrain from commenting on the interesting developments and contrasts that can take place in this remarkable body in the space of a couple of hours.

Earlier today, I sat here and listened to the distinguished Senator from Arkansas, the very, very able chairman of our Foreign Relations Committee, lecture the Senator from Kansas (Mr. DOLE).

I heard him tell the Senator from Kansas that because of the fact that he had not been here long, he had not come

to realize the real values and traditions of this noble body which, said the Senator from Arkansas, reposed in the committee, and that the audacity that the distinguished Senator from Kansas in his youthful exuberance had displayed in daring to offer an amendment on the floor that had not been considered in the great Committee on Foreign Relations was something that clearly needed to be rebuked.

I was amused as I listened to that remarkable speech. I did not expect, however, Mr. President, to have it refunded so definitely and overwhelmingly and strinkingly in the course of a few hours.

Certainly I am glad to vote for this amendment. But I hold in my hand a whole set of amendments brought to the floor of the Senate and offered to the supplemental appropriations bill.

I do not know where these distinguished Senators were when the committee was in session. I am not a member of that subcommittee. But I was present in the full committee. And I do not recall that these amendments were brought up or were discussed. And I know my friends who are on this subcommittee well enough that I know they would have certainly informed the full committee if these amendments had been presented.

I wish the distinguished Senator from Arkansas were here to see the great respect and reverence paid to the Committee on Appropriations. What do we have a Committee on Appropriations for?

In the first breath after this bill was laid before the Senate, they added more than half a billion dollars to it. And it may be that it was justified.

I am sure of one thing, however. It never received in my hearing—and I was present—any discussion in the Committee on Appropriations.

Then one by one, we have had all of these amendments. And I do not doubt that they are worthy amendments. Like Brutus, they are all honorable, but I do so wish that the distinguished Senator from Arkansas who undertook to rebuke and to look down his nose at the poor young Senator from Kansas who dared to offer an amendment on the floor of this body that had not been offered and considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations. As a matter of fact, it had been considered by the great, sanctified Committee on Foreign Relations.

I wish the Senator from Arkansas were here, because I wonder if he has served for all of these years in the Senate and if he has been so absorbed in his whole thought and introspection that he has not seen the Senate throw down the committees and ignore their recommendations time after time after time.

I cannot understand it.

My heart went out to the poor young Senator from Kansas who was being rebuked for his audacity in daring to offer an amendment without bowing down to that great committee.

Why, to hear the speech of the distinguished Senator from Arkansas, one would think there was something sacred about the committees.

How about this performance in offering these amendments? How about this?

I am going to vote for the amendment

of the Senator from New York, but I want to know why we did not hear about it in the committee.

I am going to vote for some of these [laughter] I guess.

I certainly want to see the cities taken care of; I certainly want to see New York taken care of; I certainly want to see Philadelphia taken care of; I certainly want to see Chicago taken care of; and I want these poor city people to have everything they need. I want to pacify them so that they will not revolt and riot. Of course, I am not going to worry about some of the people eking out a livelihood in my own rural State which I represent. [Laughter.]

But I am going to suggest that in all the years I have been here I have never heard a speech on the floor of the Senate rebuking so overwhelmingly as that remarkable plea made by the distinguished Senator whom I greatly respect and admire, the Senator from Arkansas, when he just jumped on the young Senator from Kansas because he had not been here long enough to learn you must—you must—respect your committees.

This is the way respect is shown for the Committee on Appropriations. Why do we want a Committee on Appropriations?

Oh, there is another thing the Senator from Arkansas said. He suggested the Senator from Kansas was doing this to get himself in the newspapers, to get himself some notoriety.

I would not suggest for a minute that my city friends here have waited until [laughter] they come to the floor of the Senate instead of quietly taking up amendments before the Committee on Appropriations. I would not suggest for 1 minute it is done for the purpose of publicity at all, despite all that is exchanged back and forth, the stroking of backs, and the patting of each other.

But nevertheless, as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, and having great respect for the distinguished Senator from West Virginia, the Senator from Rhode Island, and the Senator from Nebraska, I am just wondering why we did not hear about some of these amendments. And I am wondering what is the use of sitting day after day trying desperately to make both ends meet and to make the resources we have at our disposal in this country stretch as widely and justly as we can. What is the use of your Committee on Appropriations laboring on this and then coming in and having the floodgates opened up with amendment after amendment—and each one of them is a beauty, each one of them is good, as in the case of this amendment that I am perfectly willing to vote for.

Nevertheless, in the aggregate they just open up the floodgates. I hope Senators will take that into consideration because, after all, this story that, "We will take it to conference," why, Mr. President, what sins have been committed under that wonderful familiar term. We take it to conference and, well, some of us have seen some of our cherished hopes perish in conference. But I have noticed that they never come back from conference with a figure that is any less;

they can under the rule but they never come back with any less figure.

So, Mr. President, I merely suggest why I am going to vote for the bill. Please do not listen any more when someone gets up and says that a Senator should not, under the traditions of this great body, offer anything until he has offered it in committee. I have never seen these amendments before; I hope I never see them again.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, it is a rare opportunity to be able to plead pure as the driven snow. I did offer this amendment before the subcommittee. The Senator from West Virginia (Mr. BYRD) affirms that. I think it was the best course. One cannot always do that for many reasons, but I agree with the Senator from New Hampshire that it is highly desirable. I hope the vote on this amendment demonstrates it is.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I support the amendments to H.R. 17499, the second supplemental appropriation bill, which are designed to allocate \$100 million for the Neighborhood Youth Corps program. If these amendments are given congressional and Presidential approval, Philadelphia would be able to fund an extra 9,120 job opportunities, while Pittsburgh would stand to gain 1,528.

The Neighborhood Youth Corps program, administered by the Department of Labor since 1965, has provided disadvantaged American youths with over 971,000 jobs opportunities. These 14- to 21-year-olds are encouraged to stay in school, and perhaps acquire a job skill useful just a few years later. Most of the work is performed in conjunction with public and private nonprofit organizations.

We are now but 1 day into the summer of 1970. We have all heard the dire predictions of what we may expect during the long, hot summer. While not joining in at this point, I do know of the problems confronting our great urban areas, and see in these amendments the means of correcting them.

I am pleased that the administration has already requested an additional \$50 million. But we must do more. A recent survey by the U.S. Conference of Mayors indicated that our cities will have great numbers of idle youths spending their summers with nothing to do. The survey showed, for example, that Philadelphia could use an additional 9,120 job opportunities above the 12,500 already proposed. Similarly, Pittsburgh needs to fill another 1,528 positions above its proposed level of 3,366.

Mr. President, disadvantaged youths all over the country are crying out for help. Most of them sincerely wish to lead productive lives. We must give them the opportunity to fulfill those wishes. The additional \$100 million proposed in these amendments for the Neighborhood Youth Corps will be money well spent, for we are, in a sense, investing in our Nation's most valuable potential resource, our youth. For this reason, I urge the Senate to favorably consider this proposal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina). The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS). On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Nevada (Mr. CANNON), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. EASTLAND), the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. GORE), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. HARRIS), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. MCCARTHY), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. McCLELLAN), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. McINTYRE), the Senator from Montana (Mr. METCALF), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. RUSSELL), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. TYDINGS), the Senator from Texas (Mr. YARBOROUGH), and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. YOUNG) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that the Senator from Nevada (Mr. BIBLE) is absent on official business.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Nevada (Mr. CANNON) would vote "yea."

Mr. GRIFFIN. I announce that the Senator from Colorado (Mr. DOMINICK) and the Senators from Oregon (Mr. HATFIELD and Mr. PACKWOOD) are necessarily absent.

The Senator from South Dakota (Mr. MUNDT) is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Arizona (Mr. GOLDWATER) is detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Oregon (Mr. HATFIELD) would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Colorado (Mr. DOMINICK) is paired with the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. MUNDT). If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado would vote "yea" and the Senator from South Dakota would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 51, nays 29, as follows:

[No. 165 Leg.]

YEAS—51

Aiken
Bayh
Boggs
Brooke
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Case
Church
Cooper
Cotton
Cranston
Dole
Eagleton
Fong
Fulbright
Goodell
Gravel

Griffin
Hart
Hartke
Hughes
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Magnuson
Mansfield
Mathias
McGee
McGovern
Mondale
Montoya
Moss
Murphy
Muskie

Nelson
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Percy
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Saxbe
Schweiker
Scott
Smith, Ill.
Spong
Stevens
Symington
Williams, N.J.

NAYS—29

Allen
Allott
Anderson
Baker
Bellmon
Bennett
Byrd, Va.
Cook
Curtis
Ellender

Ervin
Fannin
Gurney
Hansen
Holland
Hollings
Hruska
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Long

Miller
Smith, Maine
Sparkman
Stennis
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.

NOT VOTING—20

Bible
Cannon
Dodd
Dominick
Eastland
Goldwater
Gore

Harris
Hatfield
Kennedy
McCarthy
McClellan
McIntyre
Metcalf

Mundt
Packwood
Russell
Tydings
Yarborough
Young, Ohio

So the amendment offered by Mr. JAVITS for himself and other Senators was agreed to.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I have an amendment at the desk which I call up and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The BILL CLERK. The Senator from Delaware (Mr. WILLIAMS) proposes an amendment as follows:

On page 60, beginning with the language after the words Section 501. (a) strike out all down to and including line 19 on page 62 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"General Limitation on Expenditures and Net Lending.—Expenditures and net lending during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, under the Budget of the United States Government House Document 91-240—Part 1 shall not exceed the \$200,771,000,000 as being the total of such expenditures and net lending except by expenditures and net lending—

"(1) for interest in excess of the amounts estimated therefor by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget

"(2) for veterans' benefits and services in excess of the amounts estimated therefor by such revision, and

"(3) for payments from trust funds in excess of the amounts estimated therefor.

If hostilities in Vietnam cease during the fiscal year, the figure of \$200,771,000,000 in the preceding sentence shall be reduced by the amount of any decrease in Defense Department expenditures during the fiscal year occurring on account of such cessation of hostilities.

"(b) Application of Limitation to Programs.—In the administration of any program as to which—

"(1) the amount of expenditures is limited pursuant to section 3, and

"(2) the allocation, grant, apportionment, or other distribution of funds among recipients is required to be determined by application of a formula involving the amount appropriated or otherwise made available for distribution,

the amount available for expenditure (as determined by the President) shall be substituted for the amount appropriated or otherwise made available in the application of the formula."

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, this amendment is a substitute for title 5, which is the so-called expenditure control ceiling provision in this bill. The amendment which I am offering is a reproduction of the expenditure controls that were enacted in 1968 as a part of the surcharge tax bill.

The so-called expenditure control ceilings in the bill are somewhat similar to the farcical expenditure control that was enacted last year by Congress, which, as every Member knows, in effect accomplished nothing. I quote from the language of the pending bill. First it says:

Expenditures . . . of the Federal Government during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, shall not exceed \$200,771,000,000: *Provided*, That whenever action, or inaction, by

the Congress on requests for appropriations and other budgetary proposals varies from the President's recommendations reflected in the Budget for 1971 (H. Doc. 91-240, part 1), the Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall report to the President and to the Congress his estimate of the effect of such action or inaction on budget outlays, and the limitation set forth herein shall be correspondingly adjusted:

I shall not read the rest of it. But it goes on and elaborates how the ceiling can automatically be raised without further congressional action.

What this means is that under the committee bill we are allegedly putting a ceiling of \$200,771,000,000 on expenditures for fiscal 1971, which is the amount in the budget as submitted by the President, but then we are saying we are floating this ceiling on pontoons so that as either Congress or the administration increases the spending it automatically raises the debt ceiling to take care of it.

For example, on this particular bill the Senate has added a total of \$645,800,000 by rollcall votes this afternoon. That does not count the \$300 million which was added by the Senator from Louisiana on the school lunch program, which is automatically to be deducted from next year's appropriation, so I have eliminated that item. But I repeat, the Senate has appropriated \$645,800,000 more than was in the bill when it was reported by the committee.

The bill as reported by the committee was \$126 million below the budget figure, so that means we have already added \$519 million to the bill. That means that the ceiling is automatically raised \$519 million to take care of these increases, and any other increases that are voted on other appropriation bills throughout the remainder of this year or the first half of next year would likewise automatically raise the expenditure ceiling. This so-called ceiling in this pending bill has by Senate votes already been increased by over \$500 millions.

Therefore, we have a ceiling in name only, a ceiling that has not effect whatsoever. It does not control expenditures by Congress, and it does not control the executive branch. It is a farce, and I will not support such hypocrisy.

I think either we ought to have a ceiling, or else we ought to cut out the complete farce of pretending we are having one.

As an example of how this loose procedure worked last year, President Johnson submitted his budget to Congress and recommended expenditures of \$196.9 billion. President Nixon revised that figure down to around \$195 billion, and then Congress put on a ceiling of \$191.9 billion. The American taxpayers were told that we were really going to cut spending.

But the ceiling as approved last year contained this same clause, that whenever Congress increases spending the ceiling would automatically increase. The result is that we are going to spend more money this year—around \$198 to \$200 billion—under a \$191 billion ceiling, and Congress has never had to take any action. Just automatically, as Congress increased appropriations, the ceiling raised. For example, the next appro-

priation bill is an education bill, which I understand is \$500 million above the budget; under this farce, called a ceiling, that would automatically, if it were approved by Congress as reported, raise the ceiling another \$500 million.

So, as I say, we shall have a ceiling in name only. My argument is that if we are going to have a ceiling on expenditures let us put one on that means something. This amendment was drafted along lines approved by Congress in 1968 as part of the surtax bill. It is true that Congress, by legislative action, did later exempt many of the agencies, and Congress could do it again. But we would have to do it by legislative action and do it openly and knowingly; otherwise, the ceiling would be binding.

My amendment does exempt the interest on the national debt, which certainly cannot be controlled. It exempts veterans' benefit payments and services which are obligated by law, and I realize we cannot limit those because we might have more disabled veterans than contemplated as a result of the action in Vietnam, and certainly we are not going to limit those payments obligated by law.

Likewise, the amendment does not limit payments under trust funds, over which we have no control, because if an unusual number of older people retire and start drawing more retirement benefits than estimated, they must be paid. They have a right to draw those payments under the law. By the same token, if there is more unemployment than contemplated those payments have to be paid from a trust fund, and the same is true with respect to pension payments under the railroad retirement. But all other operations of Government would be controlled under this amendment; and if, for example, Congress and the administration together raised expenditures \$1 billion or \$100 million in X agency, we would automatically have to offset that in some other agency, and if Congress did not do it the President would have to do it.

I hope this amendment will be accepted by the manager of the bill.

Surely the Senate wants a realistic ceiling on expenditures.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I am constrained to state that the Senator's amendment is in the nature of a substitute, and a point of order would lie against it, and I therefore make that point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina). The amendment obviously imposes legislation on a general appropriation bill, which is not in order under rule XVI, paragraph 4. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I shall be brief. I concede that the amendment is legislation. However, I point out that the language in the bill that came over from the House of Representatives is likewise legislation, and it would seem that amending a legislative proposal would be in order.

I could appeal from the decision of the Chair, and I think make a fairly good argument on it, but I am not going to do it. I do notify the Senate now that in my judgment, and I think it will be gener-

ally agreed, this so-called ceiling in this bill is not worth the paper it is written on. It is a complete farce. It misleads the American people into thinking that we are doing something when in reality we are not.

In the next few days it is expected that Congress will be voting on the question of raising the debt ceiling to finance some of the expenditures that are in this bill and these other appropriation bills. That bill will be before the Senate in the next few days, and this amendment will be offered as a part of that bill. I want the Senate to be on notice. I shall accept the point of order not so very reluctantly, because I point out that I shall be a conferee on the next bill on which this amendment will be riding, and I think I shall be just as well placed.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. The Senator is correct. The House opened the door when it wrote language into the appropriation bill, and the Senate amended that language, the door already having been opened. But in view of the fact that the Senator's amendment is in the nature of a substitute, a point of order would lie against it. The Senator could force us to a vote and raise the question of germaneness. The Senator has stated his intention to bring this matter before the Senate again at a later date, and he has the vehicle upon which he can do that. I appreciate the fact that he is not going to force this to a vote.

I make the point of order, Mr. President.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I appreciate the position of the Senator. I think if we are going to have a ceiling on expenditures it should be in advance of our action on other appropriation bills for the 1971 fiscal year. By serving notice now that this amendment will be offered, and since we will have to vote on the bill dealing with the debt ceiling before July 1, Congress will have a chance to be on record as to whether we really want bona fide expenditure controls or whether we just want to go through the farce another year of putting on a flexible ceiling which serves no purpose except that we can brag to our constituents about how we voted for a ceiling. But the so-called ceiling in this bill is on pontoons, so that as the tide (or expenditures) rises the ceiling floats higher.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order has been sustained.

INTER-AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK STAFF LOANS AMENDMENT

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, I should like to propound a question to the distinguished Senator from Wyoming (Mr. McGEE), who is chairman of the Subcommittee on Foreign Aid Appropriations.

Is it true that section 603 of the bill which provides that "None of the funds contained in this Act available to the Inter-American Development Bank shall be used directly or indirectly as grants or loans to officers or members of the staff of the Inter-American Development Bank" would require the United States to qualify its subscription to the callable capital of that Bank?

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, let me say to my colleague from Hawaii, who is the

ranking minority member of the subcommittee, that it is now the judgment of the expert consultants on the language of the bill that it would not. Since the issue at stake was the proposal in the amendment to regulate loans to staff members in the Inter-American Bank, if this does not affect the U.S. operations within the Bank, and does not call into question its ability to back up the subscriptions in the Bank, our judgment is that we can, indeed, go along with and support the committee's amendment that is already written into the pending legislation.

The purpose of section 603 is to bring to the attention of the executive branch and the Bank our concern about the Inter-American Development Bank staff loan program. While the Appropriations Committee believes that this program should be re-examined in the context of the Executive Board of the Bank with a view toward making changes in it, section 603 would not require the United States to qualify its subscription to the Bank. There are two reasons for this: First, the appropriation is for the purpose of allowing the United States to subscribe to the Bank's callable capital and involves no expenditure of funds. The callable capital stands behind the Bank's borrowings in capital markets and it is highly unlikely that the capital subscription will ever be called and result in actual use of the appropriated funds. Second, under article II, section 4(a) (ii) of the Bank's charter, the callable capital of the Bank is subject to call only when required to meet the obligations of the Bank to its bondholders and holders of Bank guarantees. There is no other purpose for which the callable capital subscription could be used under the Bank's charter.

Thus, the Bank's charter assures complete compliance with the requirements of section 603 that the funds appropriated not be used directly or indirectly for loans to the staff and no qualification of our subscription is necessary.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to the bill which is in the nature of correction of a technical error. I ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 14, strike lines 4 through 6, insert in lieu thereof:

"For an additional amount for grants or loans for specific hospitals and related facilities pursuant to section 601(b) of the Public Health Service Act, \$8,703,078; without regard to the allotments and priority provisions of Title VI of the Public Health Service Act."

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, before I explain why this is a technical correction. I would like to express my sincere appreciation to the distinguished chairman of the Deficiencies and Supplementals Subcommittee, the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. BYRD), the members of his subcommittee, and my colleagues on the full Appropriations Committee for including with H.R. 17399, the supplemental appropriations bill, financial as-

sistance for 35 health facilities in nine States that have been the accidental victims of cutback in funding for the Hill-Burton program's modernization and construction activities.

The committee's decision to adopt this amendment for inclusion in the 1970 supplemental bill signals a recognition of the Federal commitment to provide assistance to those health facilities that are in desperate need of financial aid. I ask unanimous consent that the list of projects under construction with commitments from State Hill-Burton agencies be printed in the Record at the end of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. PROXMIRE. The General Counsel of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has today ruled that the \$8,703,078 included in the bill for the financing of 35 hospitals in a number of States has to be allocated among all 50 States under the language currently contained in the bill. It was the Appropriations Committee's intent to assist just these 35 hospitals—hospitals whose construction was begun only after the Federal Government had committed itself to sharing the cost of completion. The 35 installations are in particularly difficult straits because State and local governments as well as private citizens have pledged themselves to provide part of the financing, construction has been begun, and now the Federal Government has reneged, leaving States, localities, and private citizens holding the bag.

So that the Appropriations Committee's intent can be fulfilled, I move that my amendment, which permits these funds to be spent on just the 35 hospitals rather than allocated among all the 50 States, be accepted. The alternatives would be to appropriate a far greater amount—I might say a prohibitive amount in terms of a supplemental appropriations bill—or to let these 35 installations; many of which are virtually completed and stand idle.

Mr. President, for years I have spoken out against excessive Federal spending when I have felt such spending was not in the public interest. I believe, however, that funding for the health facilities in these nine States is in the public interest. Let me explain why.

Construction of these facilities was begun as the result of Federal grants and in the belief, anchored by a moral commitment on the part of the Federal Government, that additional Federal assistance would be forthcoming. Without this assistance, construction in all likelihood would not have been undertaken. Let me give an example.

In 1966, in order to replace an inadequate facility which could not meet the needs of 75,000 residents, the Beloit, Wis., hospital board approached the State Hill-Burton agency and was granted a pledge of Federal aid for 40 percent of the total cost of construction. On the basis of this pledge, the community raised \$3.5 million in private donations, and sold \$5.4 million in municipal bonds. Hospital construction

began in November of 1967. During the 2½ years of construction, 76 contractors, and 200 workers were engaged in building this structure.

However, the administration has simply not included sufficient funds in its fiscal 1970 or 1971 budgets to meet its obligations in this area. As a result the Beloit Hospital is now over \$1.5 million in the red. If the funds are not forthcoming from the Federal Government, liens will be placed on the building. Expensive refinancing will be the only alternative. As a result the entire community will be seriously and adversely affected.

Multiply the Beloit experience by 35 and you will understand the full significance of the cutback of Hill-Burton funds on health facilities throughout the Nation.

Some have questioned whether or not there is a legal commitment on the part of the Federal Government under the Hill-Burton Act to provide funds in this area. My distinguished colleague the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. CURTIS) has supplied me with a copy of a contract for the Madonna Nursing Home at Lincoln, Neb., which shows in no uncertain terms that in this case a legal commitment was made on the part of the Federal Government.

My colleague from Nebraska also sent me a copy of his letter to Representative ROBERT MICHEL explaining the legal obligation. In that letter, Senator CURTIS stated:

I cannot speak for the other 34 projects in the amendment, but I do have in my possession a copy of such a contract for the Madonna Nursing Home at Lincoln, Nebraska, which I am attaching for your information and study. I feel that a signed, sealed and delivered contract obligating Fiscal 1970 funds for the completion of a project is a commitment.

On Page 2 you will note the contract states that the Surgeon General certified "final approval of the application for Federal funds—and, on behalf of the United States, hereby obligates for such project out of appropriated funds allotted to the State of Nebraska for Fiscal years 1968, 1969, and 1970 the total sum of \$999,425.97." The contract was signed on November 26, 1969 by the Regional Health Director of HEW for the Surgeon General.

The Madonna Home received \$500,000 in Part IV Hill-Burton funds from Fiscal 1968 and 1969 appropriations. The balance of \$499,429.97 was to have been received from Fiscal 1970 appropriations. The commitment was made and the contract signed to provide the balance under the Continuing Resolution which resulted from the long delay last year in passage of the Fiscal 1970 HEW appropriations bill. When the appropriations finally were passed, they fell short of the promise made in the Continuing Resolution. Nebraska's total allocation was only \$447,909 for Part IV, leaving a balance owed by the Federal Government for the Madonna Home project in the amount of \$51,516.97.

The facts are: (1) The Department of Health, Education and Welfare proceeded in good faith to enter into a contract to pay a given amount within a given period of time on the basis of a Continuing Resolution passed by the Congress; (2) The contract constituted a promise by the Federal Government to bear a given amount of the cost of a construction project which was allowed to proceed as a result; and (3) The Congress broke this promise by appropriating

less funds than the Continuing Resolution provided.

Thus, fulfillment of the Federal funds pledged to the Madonna Home project in Lincoln does not constitute forward funding but rather past funding of a commitment due under signed contract.

Mr. President, I hope that this information will be of assistance to the distinguished Senator from West Virginia (Mr. BYRD) in pressing for this amendment in conference.

Mr. President, before closing I would like to make one additional comment. Contained within the supplemental appropriations bill is a \$57,000 item for increased pay costs for the Subversive Activities Control Board.

The Subversive Activities Control Board has been in existence for 20 years. During this time the Board has achieved exactly nothing. It has had its statutory duties reduced to zero by a succession of

court decisions. It literally has nothing to do.

Since the fiscal year is almost at an end, I will not oppose this item. I would like to serve notice, however, that I fully intend to offer an amendment to the fiscal 1971 State-Justice-Commerce appropriations bill to strike out the \$401,100 appropriations request for the SACB.

I believe it is an insult to the American taxpayer to continue financing the inactivities of this do-nothing Board.

EXHIBIT 1

LIST OF PROJECTS UNDER CONSTRUCTION WITH COMMITMENT FROM STATE HILL-BURTON AGENCY, WHICH ARE AFFECTED BY REDUCED FISCAL APPROPRIATION

State and name of hospital	Location	Amount	State and name of hospital	Location	Amount
New Hampshire: Grafton County Nursing Home	Haverhill	\$2,524	Nebraska:		
Maryland:			Mary Lanning Hospital	Hastings	\$140,000
Baltimore City Hospital, "A" building	Baltimore	43,218	St. Elizabeth's Hospital	Lincoln	100,000
Dorchester County Public Health Center	Cambridge	16,731	Madonna Nursing Home	do	52,000
Total		59,949	Total, Nebraska		292,000
North Carolina: North Carolina Baptist Hospital	Winston-Salem	386,356	Oklahoma:		
Wisconsin:			Alva General Hospital	Alva	55,000
St. Mary's Hospital	Wausau	50,000	Norman Municipal Hospital	Norman	500,000
Vernon Memorial Hospital	Viroqua	17,214	Oklahoma City-County Health Department	Oklahoma City	650,000
St. Michael's Hospital	Stevens Point	330,100	Hillcrest Medical Center	Tulsa	1,250,000
Beloit Memorial Hospital	Beloit	1,020,575	Newman Memorial Hospital	Shattuck	20,000
Victory Memorial Hospital	Stanley	34,397	Purcell Municipal Hospital	Purcell	5,000
Total		1,452,286	Southwestern Memorial Hospital	Weatherford	255,000
Indiana:			Okfuskee Memorial Hospital	Okemah	30,000
St. Mary Mercy Hospital	Gary	250,443	Deaconess Hospital	Oklahoma City	324,275
Union Hospital	Terre Haute		Central State Hospital Children's Unit	Norman	225,000
Kansas:			Arkview Hospital	El Reno	600,000
St. Francis Hospital	Topeka	288,496	Cimarron Memorial Hospital	Boise City	15,000
St. John's Hospital	Salina	68,328	Total, Oklahoma		3,929,275
Mount Carmel Hospital	Pittsburg	273,312	Arkansas:		
St. Luke's Hospital	Wellington	129,064	St. Vincent's Hospital	Little Rock	200,000
McPherson County Hospital	McPherson	219,349	Baptist Medical Center	do	1,000,000
Wyandotte Health Center	Kansas City	146,233	Total, Arkansas		1,200,000
Northwest Medical Center	Goodland	5,463	Grand total		8,703,078
Total, Kansas		1,130,245			

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I move that this amendment be adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. EAGLETON. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 2, line 25, strike "\$4,042,000" and substitute in lieu thereof "\$5,831,000."

On page 3, between lines 16 and 17, insert the following:

"For an additional amount for 'Public Safety' as may be necessary to assist in meeting costs associated with salary increases for policemen and firemen for the period July 1, 1969, to December 31, 1969, \$1,789,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri wish his amendments considered en bloc?

Mr. EAGLETON. Yes. I ask unanimous consent that the amendments be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. EAGLETON. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendments.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold that request?

Mr. EAGLETON. I withhold the request.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the hour is 9 o'clock, and I would

hope that we would not be here too much longer. Certainly, it is my determination to complete this bill tonight and not let it lie overnight to come back tomorrow and start all over again. I would hope that the Senator would not ask for the yeas and nays. If he will not, I will be willing to accept his amendments.

Mr. EAGLETON. That is perfectly fine with me. Shall I explain the amendment, just briefly?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Please do.

Mr. COOK. Mr. President, do I correctly understand that the figure on line 19 is increased from \$100,000 to \$1,100,000?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendments again.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 2, line 25, strike "\$4,042,000" and substitute in lieu thereof "\$5,831,000."

On page 3, between lines 16 and 17, insert the following:

"For an additional amount for 'Public Safety' as may be necessary to assist in meeting costs associated with salary increases for policemen and firemen for the period July 1, 1969, to December 31, 1969, \$1,789,000."

Mr. COOK. I thank the Chair.

Mr. EAGLETON. Mr. President, this amendment relates to the District of Columbia and concerns itself with the funding of retroactive pay for policemen and firemen in the District of Columbia.

Last year's Federal payment to the District was \$110 million. Of that amount, \$1,789,000 remains unappropriated. The policemen's, firemen's, and

teachers' pay raise bill already acted upon by the Senate, and the conference report thereon passed today by the House and scheduled for Senate action on Wednesday, contains \$10,800,000 in retroactive pay for the policemen, firemen, and teachers in the District.

Of this amount, the bill authorizes a Federal contribution of only \$8 million. Thus, there is a short fall of \$2.8 million that will have to be picked up by the District government.

If this amendment is adopted, \$1,789,000 of that short fall would be taken care of by appropriating the remaining portion of the annual Federal payment authorized for fiscal year 1970. Since Congress is imposing these retroactive pay provisions on the city government without providing sufficient funds to pay for them, I think the only fair way to utilize the remainder of the funds which would otherwise lapse by June 30 is the payment of this retroactive pay. Mr. President, that is the purpose of my amendment.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I laud the Senator on what he seeks to do here. I appreciate the fact that he is not going to ask for the yeas and nays. I, therefore, am willing to accept the amendment. I do not see the ranking minority member in the Chamber at the moment, but I feel that I can speak for him as well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina). The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Missouri.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment which will provide for an additional \$322,000 for the U.S. Park Police, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

On page 41, line 21, strike: "\$3,359,000" and insert in lieu thereof: "\$3,681,000".

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. There is presently pending before the President the bill, S. 2694, which provides an average 11.4-percent pay raise for the U.S. Park Police retroactive to July 12, 1969. Obviously, this late in the fiscal year, it is not possible for this sum to be absorbed by the National Park Service.

I ask that the justification prepared by Mr. George B. Hartzog, Director of the National Park Service, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE,
Washington, D.C.
Washington, D.C. June 18, 1970.

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Deficiencies
and Supplementals, Committee on Ap-
propriations, U.S. Senate, Washington,
D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BYRD: S. 2694, which is now pending approval of the President, provides an average 11.4 percent pay raise for the United States Park Police retroactive to July 12, 1969. The estimated cost, most of which has already accrued under the retroactive feature of the bill, totals \$322,000. Due to the late congressional action on this bill, it was not possible to have a supplemental estimate presented for congressional consideration prior to Senate Appropriations Committee action on H.R. 17399, making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970. Due to the lateness in the fiscal year, it will not be possible for the National Park Service to make the retroactive payments within its remaining fund resources. Accordingly, it is of utmost importance that provision be made in H.R. 17399 to provide the additional funds required.

We understand your staff has discussed this matter with the Bureau of the Budget. The additional funds could be provided by an amendment to H.R. 17399 as follows: Page 41, line 21, delete \$3,359,000 and insert in lieu thereof \$3,681,000.

Your cooperation and assistance are much appreciated.

Sincerely yours,
GEORGE B. HARTZOG, Jr.,
Director.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I urge adoption of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator of West Virginia.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the amendment was adopted be reconsidered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on page 4 of the second supple-

mental appropriation bill, there will be found a Senate committee amendment making an appropriation of \$250 million for foreign military credit sales. On page 13 of the report from the committee, which I filed on this bill on June 8, 1970, it is made clear that the authorization for this appropriation had not been enacted into law and that the committee had included language which provided that these funds would only become available upon the enactment of the Foreign Military Credit Sales Authorization Act, H.R. 15628, or similar legislation.

I have been advised that the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate objects to these funds being included in this bill prior to the enactment of authorizing legislation so, consequently, I make a point of order against the amendment as being legislation on an appropriation bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina). The Chair would advise the Senator from West Virginia that this involves legislation on a general appropriation bill and under Rule XVI, paragraph 4, is not in order. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I thank the Presiding Officer.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that any technical changes which may be authorized in the language, be included in the engrossment of the bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered and all technical amendments will be included in the engrossment of the bill.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, so far as I know, there are no further amendments to be offered at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further amendments to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on final passage of the bill.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina). The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

On question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Nevada (Mr. CANNON), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. EASTLAND), the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. GORE), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. HARRIS), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. MCCARTHY), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. MCCLELLAN), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. MCINTYRE), the Senator from Montana (Mr. METCALF), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. RUSSELL), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. TYDINGS), the Senator from Texas (Mr. YARBOR-

OUGH), and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. YOUNG) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that the Senator from Nevada (Mr. BIBLE) is absent on official business.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Nevada (Mr. CANNON), and the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. MCINTYRE) would each vote "yea."

Mr. GRIFFIN. I announce that the Senator from Colorado (Dr. DOMINICK) and the Senators from Oregon (Mr. HATFIELD and Mr. PACKWOOD) are necessarily absent.

The Senator from South Dakota (Mr. MUNDT) is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Kentucky (Mr. COOPER), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. GOLDWATER) and the Senator from Texas (Mr. TOWER) are detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado (Mr. DOMINICK), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. HATFIELD), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. MUNDT), and the Senator from Texas (Mr. TOWER) would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 76, nays 2, as follows:

[No. 166 Leg.]

YEAS—76

Aiken	Gravel	Muskie
Allen	Griffin	Nelson
Allott	Gurney	Pastore
Anderson	Hansen	Pearson
Baker	Hart	Pell
Bayh	Hartke	Percy
Bellmon	Holland	Prouty
Bennett	Hollings	Proxmire
Boggs	Hruska	Randolph
Brooke	Hughes	Ribicoff
Burdick	Inouye	Saxbe
Byrd, Va.	Jackson	Schweiker
Byrd, W. Va.	Javits	Scott
Case	Jordan, N.C.	Smith, Maine
Church	Jordan, Idaho	Smith, Ill.
Cook	Long	Sparkman
Cranston	Magnuson	Spong
Curtis	Mansfield	Stennis
Dole	Mathias	Stevens
Eagleton	McGee	Symington
Ellender	McGovern	Talmadge
Ervin	Miller	Thurmond
Fannin	Mondale	Williams, N.J.
Fong	Montoya	Young, N. Dak.
Fulbright	Moss	
Goodell	Murphy	

NAYS—2

Cotton Williams, Del.

NOT VOTING—22

Bible	Harris	Packwood
Cannon	Hatfield	Russell
Cooper	Kennedy	Tower
Dodd	McCarthy	Tydings
Dominick	McClellan	Yarborough
Eastland	McIntyre	Young, Ohio
Goldwater	Metcalfe	
Gore	Mundt	

So the bill (H.R. 15628) was passed.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference with the House, and that the Chair be authorized to appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer (Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina) appointed Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, and Mr. ALLOTT conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, no words can express adequately the respect

and admiration I have for the distinguished Senator from West Virginia (Mr. BYRD). His superb handling of this supplemental funding measure was unexcelled. His complete understanding of every last detail of this proposal was truly outstanding.

I must say that the Senate's quick and overwhelming acceptance of this measure is action typically accorded to proposals handled by Senator BYRD. Indeed, earlier today as I recall, the Senate voted overwhelmingly to accept the Byrd amendment to the then pending Cooper-Church amendment. His thorough preparation and full explanation as always was joined by the able advocacy that has characterized Senator BYRD's endeavors in this body throughout the years. I applaud him for this great achievement. It adds another fine accomplishment to an already abundant record.

Let me just say that I appreciate especially Senator BYRD's efforts with regard to the amendment dealing with funds for the National Science Foundation. It is this type of action I might say that has made Senator BYRD a legislator whose effectiveness and ability to get things done are unexcelled in this body.

To Senator HRUSKA who filled in so ably for Senator MUNDT who is recuperating, I also offer the thanks of a grateful Senate. His support and assistance were absolutely vital to this great success.

To the Senate, I especially am grateful. Our action in passing this measure tonight demonstrates beyond all doubt the great effects that stem directly from the cooperation that prevails in this body. I say this in all sincerity. Each Senator cooperated by remaining on the subject of this vitally important measure until it was disposed of just now. By so honoring the spirit of the so-called germaneness rule we have made a great deal of progress. I hope this action sets the tone for the remainder of the week; if not, of the entire session. I personally am deeply grateful.

METROPOLITAN POLICE, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, prior to reporting this bill to the Senate, the subcommittee was advised that an article in the *Washington Post* on Saturday, May 30, 1970, indicated that Police Chief Jerry Wilson could not hire sufficient men to reach the goal of 5,100 by the end of June unless he received final action by Congress on the new level by Monday, June 1, 1970. In view of the urgency of this matter, Senator HRUSKA, who is the acting ranking minority member of the subcommittee, and I, in my capacity as subcommittee chairman, agreed that the full Appropriations Committee should be polled to determine whether they would approve the appropriation, which was contained in the bill as it came from the House, for 475 police positions to bring the force to a total of 5,100 men; \$363,000 in pay costs for the month of June was involved.

The results of the polling of the full committee were favorable to this item

and the Chief was so advised. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the *RECORD* the copy of the telegram which was sent to Chief Wilson from the subcommittee chairman and Senator HRUSKA, as well as the response received by the committee from Chief Wilson.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the *RECORD*, as follows:

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
METROPOLITAN POLICE DEPARTMENT,
June 9, 1970.

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Deficiencies
and Supplemental Appropriations, U.S.
Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BYRD: Thank you for your telegram of June 1st, advising me that your Committee authorizes this Department to proceed with the 5,100 recruitment figure by the end of June. I have noted your decision and we optimistically look forward to reaching that goal by the end of June.

Thank you for your excellent cooperation on this and previous occasions.

Sincerely yours,

JERRY V. WILSON,
Chief of Police.

JUNE 1, 1970.

Chief of Police JERRY V. WILSON,
Metropolitan Police Department,
Washington, D.C.:

We desire to refer to the *Washington Post* story on Saturday, May 30, 1970, which stated: "Police Chief Jerry V. Wilson said yesterday he could not hire enough men to reach 5,100 by the end of June unless he got final action by Congress on the new level by Monday." The undersigned, representing the full Senate Committee on Appropriations, after having polled the Committee, authorize you to proceed with the 5,100 recruitment figure by the end of June. The Committee insists that the highest mental, moral and physical standards be maintained by the Department in achieving your announced goal.

ROBERT C. BYRD,
Subcommittee on Deficiencies and Supplemental Appropriations.

ROMAN L. HRUSKA,
Acting Ranking Minority Member, Subcommittee on Deficiencies and Supplemental Appropriations, Committee on Appropriations, U.S. Senate.

THE PENN CENTRAL DEBACLE

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I would like to take a few minutes to comment briefly on the Penn Central bankruptcy.

For many years I have been concerned about the fate of the railroads on the east coast. This recent crisis leads me to make a number of observations.

First, the immediate cause of the Penn Central's bankruptcy is the unwise and untimely tight money policy of the Nixon administration. It has caused a corporation in a conglomerate worth \$7 billion to go bankrupt for the lack of operating capital.

Second, one of the main causes for the Penn Central's bankruptcy can be traced back many years to a very unfortunate milking of the railroad's assets for investments in other than rail transportation. In years when the railroads that now have merged into the Penn Central should have reinvested their profits into capital improvements for passenger and freight service, those funds were being drained into other ventures.

Third, the Penn Central merger which was hailed as the panacea for the east coast rail problems created a constipated monster. Instead of the predicted economies of scale, the merger resulted in confusion and retrenchment of enormous proportions. Freight service worsened. Freight in transit from the Great Lakes to the east coast was frequently lost or damaged and passenger service was cut back.

Fourth, the Federal Government's unbalanced transportation policy aggravated the Penn Central's passenger train losses. Running parallel to nearly all of the Penn Central's main passenger line, interstate highways were constructed. These highways together with Penn Central's desire to eliminate much of the passenger service nailed the coffin shut for passenger service.

It seems to me that this situation demands that a number of steps be taken.

First, to the degree that profits have drained from Penn Central's rail interests to develop its other conglomerate activities, Penn Central should be required to liquidate those assets to meet its rail transportation obligations.

Second, the Penn Central passenger service should then be broken up into a number of regional nonprofit corporations. Regional nonprofit corporations should be formed for the urban corridors within Penn Central's jurisdiction, as I have suggested in recent legislation. The Interstate Commerce Commission should be temporarily relieved of its responsibility for Penn Central's passenger service until this reorganization is completed.

Third, the Congress should proceed forthwith with enactment of the Rail Passenger Service Act of 1970 which passed the Senate this past month. I hope the House will pass this bill in the form of my substitute bill which Congressman TIERNAN has introduced in the House.

Fourth, since all railroads are facing liquidity problems, the Congress should consider assuming ownership of the rail rights-of-way and signaling system. This would relieve the railroads of a major debt and tax burden, and would not demand a flow of Federal moneys from the Treasury. A railroad trust fund based on user charges should then be established for maintenance of the roadbeds.

Mr. President, the Penn Central's bankruptcy is truly a result of a monumental collection of errors and of drift on the part of all concerned. The public deserves better. I would hope that the bankruptcy court, the Department of Transportation, and the Interstate Commerce Commission will heed these suggestions and resolve the east coast rail problem once and for all.

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT UPON SIGNING THE EXTENSION OF THE VOTING RIGHTS ACT OF 1965

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, today President Nixon signed a bill extending and amending the so-called Voting Rights Act of 1965. I ask unanimous consent that the statement issued by the President be printed in the *RECORD*.

DIGEST of Congressional Proceedings

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(FOR INFORMATION ONLY;
NOT TO BE QUOTED OR CITED)

For actions of June 23, 1970
91st-2nd; No. 104

CONTENTS

Aging.....19	Information Lists.....33	River Basin.....5,13
Appropriations.....4, 10	Lands.....2,14	River Basin Loans.....36
Economy.....17,28,30	L-Dopa.....6	Rural Development.....29
Electrification.....7	Logs.....35	Second Supplemental.....10
Environment.....8,31	Meat Imports.....37	Solid Waste.....12
Farm Foundation.....24	Minerals.....34	Symbol.....5
Farm Prices.....30	National Parks.....5	Tariffs.....6
Flood Control.....38	Personnel.....27	Taxation.....32
Food.....19	Pesticides.....16	Textiles.....15,26
Foreign Trade.....15,26	Pollution.....18,20	Tobacco.....39
Golden Eagle.....1,25	Postal Reform.....21	Veto Message.....11
Housing.....9	Reclamation.....2	Walla-Walla Project.....3
HUD.....4	Recreation.....1,25	Watershed.....23
Inflation.....22	Research Programs.....12	

SENATE

1. RECREATION. Agreed to House amendments to S. 2315, restoring the Golden Eagle program. This bill now goes to the President. p. S9614
2. RECLAMATION. Agreed to the conference report on S.2062, differentiating between private and public ownership of lands in the administration of the acreage-limitation provisions of Federal reclamation law. This bill now goes to the President. pp. S9614-5
3. WALLA-WALLA PROJECT. Agreed to the conference report on S.743, authorizing the construction, operation and maintenance of the Touchet division, Walla-Walla project, Oregon-Washington. This bill now goes to the President. p. S9615

4. APPROPRIATIONS. An Appropriations Committee subcommittee approved for full committee consideration HR 17548, with amendments, the HJD appropriations bill FY 71. p. D669
5. RIVER BASIN; NATIONAL PARKS; SYMBOL. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) the following bills:
 - S. 3547, amended, authorizing the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Narrows unit, Missouri River Basin project, Colorado;
 - S. 531, amended, establishing the Capitol Reef National Park, Utah;
 - S. 532, amended, establishing the Arches National Park, Utah; and
 - S. 3838, preventing the unauthorized manufacture, reproduction, and use of the antilitter symbol "Johnny Horizon". p. D669
6. TARIFFS. The Finance Committee reported, without amendment, HR 8512, suspending for a temporary period the import duty on L-Dopa (S. Rept. No. 91-940). p. S9549
7. ELECTRIFICATION. Received a report from the Administrator, REA, on the approval of a loan to the South Texas Electric Cooperative, Inc., Victoria, Texas, for the financing of certain new transmission facilities, minor improvements to existing generation facilities, and the completion of previously loaned facilities to the Committee on Appropriations. pp. S9548-9
8. ENVIRONMENT. The Public Works Committee reported an original bill, S. 4012, extending the Clean Air Act and the Solid Waste Disposal Act for 60 days (S. Rept. No. 91-941). p. S9549
 - Sen. Eagleton inserted Sen. Muskie's speech "Corporate Responsibility and the Environment". pp. S9567-9
 - Sen. Mathias inserted an article suggesting an international agency be established to solve environment problems. pp. S9569-71
 - Sen. Proxmire discussed his bill, S. 3181, the proposed Regional Water Quality Act of 1970, and urged action on it. pp. S9583-4
9. HOUSING. Sen Mathias inserted an article discussing the growth of vacation-home and second-home market. pp. S9573-4

HOUSE

10. APPROPRIATIONS. Disagreed to the Senate amendments to HR 17399, the second supplemental appropriations bill, FY 70, and appointed conferees. p. H5916
11. VETO MESSAGE. Received the President's veto message on HR 11102, the Medical Facilities Construction and Modernization Amendments of 1970 (H. Doc. 91-353). pp. H5899-900
12. SOLID WASTE. Passed without amendment, HR 11833 amending the Solid Waste Disposal Act to provide financial assistance for the construction of solid waste disposal facilities, to improve research programs pursuant to such act. pp. H5901-16

So the Bureau of the Budget did not express themselves one way or another.

Mr. GROSS. Yes, and that seems perfectly obvious even from a casual reading of the hearings. The Committee considered H.R. 15847 and H.R. 15848 and then came back to H.R. 11833 and brought that bill to the House floor.

Mr. STAGGERS. That is what the subcommittee did after their deliberations and it was certainly within their rights to do so after hearing all of the testimony and deciding that it was the best bill to bring to the floor, I am sure, in this instance.

Mr. GROSS. Well, we do not know whether events in the future will dictate a veto of this bill, on the basis that it exceeds the budget. We do not know what the future holds for this legislation in the way of acceptance at the White House.

Mr. STAGGERS. We have no indication of any such thing as a veto. We have consulted with the administration about the bill and I would certainly not think there would be a veto.

Mr. GROSS. Well, pollution and environment are fast becoming sacred cows. I would not know what to look forward to in the future.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The committee substitute amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ABERNETHY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 11833) to amend the Solid Waste Disposal Act in order to provide financial assistance for the construction of solid waste disposal facilities, to improve research programs pursuant to such act, and for other purposes, pursuant to H.R. 1068, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 337, nays 0, not voting 92, as follows:

[Roll No. 184]

YEAS—337

Abbitt	Esch	McFall
Abernethy	Evans, Colo.	Macdonald,
Adams	Evins, Tenn.	Mass.
Albert	Fallon	Madden
Alexander	Fascell	Mahon
Anderson,	Findley	Mailliard
Calif.	Fisher	Mann
Anderson, Ill.	Flood	Marsh
Andrews, Ala.	Flowers	Martin
Annunzio	Flynt	Mathias
Ashbrook	Foley	Matsunaga
Ashley	Ford,	May
Aspinall	William D.	Mayne
Ayres	Foreman	Meeds
Baring	Fountain	Melcher
Barrett	Fraser	Miller, Calif.
Belcher	Frelinghuysen	Miller, Ohio
Bell, Calif.	Frey	Mills
Bennett	Friedel	Minish
Berry	Fulton, Pa.	Mink
Betts	Fulton, Tenn.	Mize
Bevill	Fuqua	Mizell
Biaggi	Galifianakis	Monagan
Blester	Gallagher	Moorhead
Blanton	Garmatz	Morse
Blatnik	Gettys	Morton
Boland	Giulmo	Mosher
Bolling	Gibbons	Moss
Brademas	Goldwater	Murphy, Ill.
Bray	Gonzalez	Myers
Brinkley	Goodling	Natcher
Brooks	Green, Pa.	Nedzi
Broomfield	Griffin	Nelsen
Brotzman	Griffiths	Nichols
Brown, Calif.	Gross	Nix
Brown, Mich.	Gubser	Obey
Brown, Ohio	Gude	O'Hara
Broyhill, N.C.	Hagan	O'Konski
Broyhill, Va.	Haley	Olsen
Buchanan	Hall	O'Neill, Mass.
Burke, Fla.	Halpern	Pasman
Burke, Mass.	Hansen, Wash.	Patman
Burleson, Tex.	Harrington	Patten
Burlison, Mo.	Harsha	Pelly
Burton, Calif.	Harvey	Pepper
Burton, Utah	Hathaway	Perkins
Bush	Hays	Pettis
Button	Hébert	Philbin
Byrne, Pa.	Hechler, W. Va.	Pickle
Cabell	Heckler, Mass.	Pike
Camp	Helstoski	Pirnie
Carter	Henderson	Poage
Casey	Hicks	Roff
Cederberg	Hogan	Prayer, N.C.
Chamberlain	Holifield	Price, Tex.
Chappell	Horton	Pryor, Ark.
Clark	Hosmer	Pucinski
Clawson, Del.	Hull	Quile
Clay	Hungate	Quillen
Cleveland	Hunt	Rallsback
Cobelan	Hutchinson	Randall
Collier	Ichord	Rarick
Collins	Jacobs	Rees
Colmer	Jarman	Reid, Ill.
Conte	Johnson, Calif.	Reifel
Corbett	Johnson, Pa.	Reuss
Corman	Jonas	Rhodes
Coughlin	Jones, Ala.	Riegle
Cowger	Jones, N.C.	Rivers
Cramer	Jones, Tenn.	Roberts
Crane	Karth	Rodino
Culver	Kastenmeier	Roe
Cunningham	Kazen	Rogers, Colo.
Daniel, Va.	Kee	Rogers, Fla.
Davis, Ga.	King	Rooney, Pa.
Dellenback	Kleppe	Rostenkowski
Denney	Kluczynski	Roudebush
Dennis	Kuykendall	Ruppe
Derwinski	Kyl	Ruth
Devine	Kyros	St Germain
Dickinson	Landgrebe	Sandman
Diggs	Langen	Satterfield
Dingell	Latta	Saylor
Donohue	Leggett	Schadeberg
Dorn	Lennon	Scherle
Dowdy	Lloyd	Schneebeli
Downing	Long, La.	Schwengel
Duncan	Long, Md.	Scott
Dwyer	Lujan	Sebelius
Eckhardt	Lukens	Shipley
Edmondson	McClory	Shriver
Edwards, Ala.	McCloskey	Sikes
Edwards, Calif.	McClure	Sisk
Edwards, La.	McCulloch	Smith, Calif.
Ellberg	McDade	Smith, N.Y.

Snyder	Thompson, Ga.	Whitehurst
Springer	Thompson, N.J.	Whitten
Stafford	Thomson, Wis.	Widnall
Staggers	Tiernan	Wiggins
Stanton	Tunney	Williams
Steed	Udall	Wilson, Bob
Steiger, Ariz.	Ullman	Winn
Steiger, Wis.	Van Deerlin	Wold
Stephens	Vander Jagt	Wright
Stokes	Vanik	Wyatt
Stubblefield	Vigorito	Wylie
Stuckey	Waggonner	Wyman
Sullivan	Waldie	Yates
Symington	Wampler	Yatron
Taft	Watkins	Zablocki
Talcott	Watts	Zion
Taylor	Whalen	Zwach
Teague, Calif.	Whalley	
Teague, Tex.	White	

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—92

Adair	Eshleman	Mikva
Addabbo	Farbstein	Minshall
Anderson,	Feighan	Mollohan
Tenn.	Fish	Montgomery
Andrews,	Ford, Gerald R.	Morgan
N. Dak.	Gaydos	Murphy, N.Y.
Arends	Gilbert	O'Neal, Ga.
Beall, Md.	Gray	Ottlinger
Bingham	Green, Oreg.	Podell
Blackburn	Grover	Pollock
Boggs	Hamilton	Powell
Bow	Hammer-	Price, Ill.
Brasco	schmidt	Purcell
Brock	Hanley	Reid, N.Y.
Byrnes, Wis.	Hanna	Robison
Caffery	Hansen, Idaho	Rooney, N.Y.
Carey	Hastings	Rosenthal
Celler	Hawkins	Roth
Chisholm	Howard	Roybal
Clancy	Keith	Ryan
Clausen,	Kirwan	Scheuer
Don H.	Koch	Skubitz
Conable	Landrum	Slack
Conyers	Lowenstein	Smith, Iowa
Daddario	McCarthy	Stratton
Daniels, N.J.	McDonald,	Watson
Davis, Wis.	Mich.	Welcker
Dawson	McEwen	Wilson,
de la Garza	McKneally	Charles H.
Delaney	McMillan	Wolff
Dent	MacGregor	Wylder
Dulski	Meskill	Young
Erlenborn	Michel	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Boggs with Mr. Gerald R. Ford.
 Mr. Delaney with Mr. Arends.
 Mr. Price of Illinois with Mr. Adair.
 Mr. Murphy with Mr. Grover.
 Mr. Mikva with Mr. Michel.
 Mr. Daddario with Mr. Meskill.
 Mr. Hanley with Mr. McKneally.
 Mr. Wolff with Mr. Wylder.
 Mr. Addabbo with Mr. Welcker.
 Mr. Dulski with Mr. McEwen.
 Mr. Young with Mr. Byrnes of Wisconsin.
 Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Bow.
 Mr. Stratton with Mr. Hastings.
 Mr. Podell with Mr. Reid of New York.
 Mr. Slack with Mr. Beall.
 Mr. Gaydos with Mr. Eshleman.
 Mr. McCarthy with Mr. Fish.
 Mr. Anderson of Tennessee with Mr. Hansen of Idaho.
 Mr. Landrum with Mr. Hammerschmidt.
 Mr. Celler with Mr. Robison.
 Mr. Hamilton with Mr. McDonald of Michigan.
 Mr. Daniels of New Jersey with Mr. Clancy.
 Mr. McMillan with Mr. Davis of Wisconsin.
 Mr. Howard with Mr. Erlenborn.
 Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Don H. Clausen.
 Mr. Mollohan with Mr. Skubitz.
 Mr. Smith of Iowa with Mr. Keith.
 Mr. Carey with Mr. Conable.
 Mr. Morgan with Mr. Watson.
 Mr. Gray with Mr. Pollock.
 Mr. Gilbert with Mr. Minshall.
 Mr. Brasco with Mr. Roth.
 Mr. Montgomery with Mr. MacGregor.

Mrs. Green of Oregon with Mr. Andrews of North Dakota.

Mr. Hanna with Mr. Brock.
Mr. O'Neal of Georgia with Mr. Blackburn.
Mr. Bingham with Mr. Conyers.
Mr. Hawkins with Mr. Ottinger.
Mr. de la Garza with Mr. Caffery.
Mr. Dent with Mr. Farbstein.
Mr. Purcell with Mr. Feighan.
Mr. Roybal with Mr. Powell.
Mr. Kirwan with Mrs. Chisholm.
Mr. Koch with Mr. Lowenstein.
Mr. Dawson with Mr. Rosenthal.
Mr. Scheuer with Mr. Ryan.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENTS OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 17399, SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1970

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 17399) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. MAHON, WHITTEN, EVINS of Tennessee, NATCHER, FLOOD, STEED, Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, and Messrs. JONAS, CEDERBERG, MICHEL, and LANGEN.

NATIONAL MACHINE TOOL WEEK

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 1194) to authorize the President to designate the period beginning September 20, 1970, and ending September 26, 1970, as "National Machine Tool Week."

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman is this National Machine Tool Week with or without widgets?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. It should be; it could be.

Mr. HALL. That is, anything to support National Machine Tool Week?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. HALL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

Mr. GROSS. Further reserving the right to object, I wonder if the gentleman thinks this is important enough that we ought to have a rollcall vote on its passage?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I am sure that we could get by without it. This is important, and we do have a number of sponsors of this resolution.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution as follows:

H.J. RES. 1194

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That as a tribute to the importance of the national machine tool industry to the American economy, in recognition of its efforts on behalf of the Nation in peace and for our national defense and with the realization of the role it must play in the development of the sophisticated machinery and equipment necessary to eliminate and prevent pollution, the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating the period beginning September 20, 1970, and ending September 26, 1970, as "National Machine Tool Week", and calling upon the people of the United States and interested groups and organizations to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL RETAILING WEEK

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 1255) to authorize and request the President to proclaim the period January 10, 1971, through January 16, 1971, as "National Retailing Week."

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution as follows:

H.J. RES. 1255

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in honor of the retailers and in recognition of the 60th Annual Convention of the National Retail Merchants Association to be held in New York, New York, during the period January 10, 1971, through January 13, 1971, the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating that period as "National Retailing Week" and calling upon the people of the United States and interested groups and organizations to observe such period with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CORRECTION OF VOTE

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 141, on May 25, 1970, I am recorded as not voting.

Mr. Speaker, I was present and voted "yea." I ask unanimous consent that the permanent Record and Journal be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

NATIONAL HAZARD: NUCLEAR POWER PLANTS

(Mr. FLOOD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.)

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, none of us here have objection to progress, and I am concerned at this time with that part of progress which deals in the realm of nuclear power and nuclear materials. We have had several examples of where those scientists and persons in charge of these programs have suggested and spoken a great deal about such programs, only to abandon them or withdraw them.

There is proposed, and talked of at least, for construction in the town of Meshopper, while not in my district, is adjacent and contiguous thereto. We have heard from our own technicians that the proposals there are largely in the realm of talk because of the nature of the breeder concerned.

I have made some statements on this and we will perhaps with the help of our own technicians proceed further to examine the potential of this plant before it is ever built. We think it is largely talk and out of an abundance of caution we must take care of ourselves.

Mr. Speaker, again I must voice concern regarding the activities of Atomic Energy Commission personnel and their evident small concern for the lives and property of fellow Americans.

Having assumed the shibboleth of "nuclear scientist," and occupying positions which are completely free from personal liability, these people have already gone far toward effectively negating our national defense by strategically placing many large nuclear power reactors in heavily populated industrial localities.

We are now confronted with the fact that some 27 of these huge repositories of radioactive poisons have been built, with another hundred planned. The smallest of these enlarged submarine-type nuclear power reactors, at full fission product inventory, is more potentially lethal than all of the chemical warfare gases ever manufactured—and there is no doubt that expert saboteurs could destroy any power reactor at will, because neither the AEC nor the public utility owner is required by law to build in such a fashion as to defend against sabotage and/or against conventional enemy action.

It is logical to assume that these monstrous containers of poison would constitute the initial targets of conventional weapons in the event of enemy action. The surprise demolition of even one of these nuclear power reactors on the densely populated Eastern Seaboard would force tens of millions of Amer-

DIGEST of Congressional Proceedings

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(FOR INFORMATION ONLY;
NOT TO BE QUOTED OR CITED)

For actions of June 24, 1970
91st-2nd, No. 105

CONTENTS

Aging.....	20,21	Grains.....	2	Pollution.....	14,17
Appropriations.....	1,10	Highways.....	7	Private Bill.....	12
Consumers.....	22	Housing.....	9	River Basin.....	6
Disaster Relief.....	11	Irrigation.....	6	Second Supplemental..	1
Environment.....	14,15	Lands.....	13	Taxation.....	16
Farm Program.....	3	Land & Water Conservation..	4	Tobacco.....	19
Festival.....	8	Motor Vehicles.....	5	Veterans Benefits...	23
Fish & Wildlife.....	18	Nutrition.....	20,21	Wheat Research.....	2

HIGHLIGHTS: Both Houses passed continuing resolution. Conferees filed report on second supplemental appropriations bill. Rep. Alexander criticized Department's failure in "the development of new farm legislation". Rep. Mizell introduced and discussed bill authorizing leasing of burley tobacco acreage allotments. House subcommittee approved proposed Wheat Research and Promotion Act.

HOUSE

1. **APPROPRIATIONS.** Both Houses passed H. J. Res. 1264, making continuing appropriations for FY 71. pp. S9745-6, H5946-9

Conferees reported HR 17399, second supplemental appropriations bill, FY 70. Agreed to amounts for USDA items as contained in the Senate version (see Digest No. 94). The Senate provision of \$300 million for the Food Stamp program was amended to change the date for the availability of such funds to cover a four instead of three-month period of time (H. Rept. No. 91-2227). pp. H6013-4

Passed HR 18127 without amendment, the public works and AEC appropriations bill, FY 71. pp. H5949-91



2. GRAINS. An Agriculture Committee subcommittee approved for the full committee HR 13543, amended, the proposed Wheat Research and Promotion Act. p. D679
3. FARM PROGRAM. Rep. Alexander criticized the Department for its failure in "the development of new farm legislation" and stated "USDA apparently cannot decide where it stands on legislative proposals". pp. H6002-3
4. LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION. The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs reported, with amendment, HR 15913, amending the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 (H. Rept. No. 91-1225). p. H6015
5. MOTOR VEHICLES. A Government Operations Committee subcommittee approved for full committee S. 2763, allowing the purchase of additional systems and equipment for passenger motor vehicles over and above the statutory price limitation. p. D680
6. RIVER BASIN; IRRIGATION. An Interior and Insular Affairs Committee subcommittee approved for full committee the following bills: HR 7521, amended, authorizing the Riverton extension unit, Missouri River Basin project; HR 9804, authorizing supplemental irrigation facilities; and HR 13001 amended, respecting the Navajo Indian irrigation project. p. D680
7. HIGHWAYS. The Ways and Means Committee agreed to a 3-year extension of the highway trust fund subject to drafting of proper legislation. p. D680
8. FESTIVAL. Several Representatives spoke in support of a resolution establishing an annual "Day of Bread" and "Harvest Festival" week in October. pp. H5943, H5994, H6011
9. HOUSING. Rep. Patman urged the restoration of title V, providing for a National Development Bank for Housing, to the proposed Emergency Home Finance Act of 1970. pp. H5996-8

SENATE

10. APPROPRIATIONS. The Appropriations Committee reported, with amendments, HR 17548, the independent offices and HUD appropriations bill, FY 71 (S. Rept. No. 91-949). p. S9671
11. DISASTER RELIEF. A Public Works Committee subcommittee approved for full committee S. 3619, with amendments, establishing a comprehensive Federal disaster relief program. p. D678
12. PRIVATE BILL. The Judiciary Committee reported without amendment HR 13740, for the relief of Kimball Brothers Lumber Company (S. Rept. No. 91-953). p. S9671
13. LANDS. Received a report of the Public Land Law Revision Commission; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. p. S9671

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1970

JUNE 24, 1970.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. MAHON, from the committee of conference,
submitted the following

CONFERENCE REPORT

[To accompany H.R. 17399]

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 17399) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 6, 14, 23, 40, 41, 42, and 43.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 5, 7, 8, 11, 17, 18, 19, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, and 60, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert \$3,997,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$129,675; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$8,048,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert \$50,000,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 61:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 61, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$4,500,000,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 2, 10, 12, 13, 15, 16, 20, 22, 24, 50, 51, and 62.

GEORGE MAHON,
JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
JOE L. EVINS,
WILLIAM H. NATCHER,
DANIEL J. FLOOD,
TOM STEED,
JULIA BUTLER HANSEN,
CHARLES R. JONAS,
ELFORD CEDERBERG,
ROBERT H. MICHEL,
ODIN LANGEN,

Managers on the Part of the House.

ROBERT C. BYRD,
JOHN O. PASTORE,
SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
JOHN L. McCLELLAN,
WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
JOHN STENNIS,
ROMAN L. HRUSKA,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
MARGARET CHASE SMITH,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT OF THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 17399) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

TITLE I

CHAPTER I—DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Amendment No. 1: Provides \$425,000 by transfer for "Extension Service, Cooperative extension work, payments, and expenses" as proposed by the Senate instead of \$597,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 2: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate provision of \$300,000,000 for the "Food stamp program," with an amendment changing the date for the availability of such funds to cover a four instead of a three-month period of time. Funds so provided are to be charged to the amount provided in the 1971 bill for this purpose, when enacted. The \$300,000,000 does not necessarily have to be prorated over the four month period. These funds are required so that the food stamp program may be continued at about its current level pending enactment of authorizing legislation for the 1971 program, and the regular annual appropriation bill.

CHAPTER III—DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Amendment No. 3: Appropriates \$3,997,000 for "Federal payment to the District of Columbia" instead of \$5,831,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 4: Appropriates \$129,675 for "General operating expenses" instead of \$2,675 as proposed by the House and \$174,675 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 5: Appropriates \$3,966,485 for "Public safety" as proposed by the Senate instead of \$2,370,500 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 6: Deletes appropriation of \$1,789,000 for "Public safety" to assist in meeting costs associated with salary increases for policemen and firemen proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 7: Appropriates \$171,750 for "Parks and recreation" as proposed by the Senate instead of \$47,300 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 8: Appropriates \$20,000 for "Settlement of claims and suits" as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 9: Appropriates \$8,048,000 for "Capital outlay" instead of \$1,658,000 as proposed by the House and \$8,768,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 10: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment to provide that \$318,000 shall be available for construction services instead of \$374,500 as proposed by the Senate.

CHAPTER V—INDEPENDENT OFFICES

Amendment No. 11: Appropriates \$157,816,600 for "Payment to Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund" as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 12: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment to appropriate \$371,000 for the General Services Administration for sites and expenses of a public buildings project at Aberdeen, Mississippi.

Amendment No. 13: Reported in disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to insist on disagreement to the amendment of the Senate which proposes to appropriate an additional \$8,800,000 for the National Science Foundation for fiscal year 1970.

Amendment No. 14: Appropriates \$7,000,000 for the "Selective Service System" as proposed by the House instead of \$7,433,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 15: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to appropriate \$350,000 for the "Council on Environmental Quality and Office of Environmental Quality", instead of \$100,000 as proposed by the House and \$400,000 as proposed by the Senate.

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

Amendment No. 16: Reported in disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to insist on disagreement to the amendment of the Senate which proposes to appropriate an additional \$587,500,000 for Urban Renewal Programs for fiscal year 1970.

CHAPTER VI—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Amendment No. 17: Appropriates \$225,000 for "Geological Survey, surveys, investigations, and research" as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 18: Appropriates \$775,000 for "National Park Service, Management and Protection" as proposed by the Senate instead of \$850,000 as proposed by the House.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Amendment No. 19: Appropriates \$21,172,000 for "Forest Protection and Utilization, Forest Land Management" as proposed by the Senate instead of \$21,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 20: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur with the Senate amendment which provides that \$172,000 of funds appropriated for "Forest Land Management" shall remain available until expended.

CHAPTER VII—DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Amendment No. 21: Appropriates \$50,000,000 for "Manpower development and training activities" instead of \$100,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 22: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment to appropriate \$2,330,000 for "Trade Adjustment Activities".

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Amendment No. 23: Deletes item proposed by the Senate to appropriate \$8,703,078 for "Hospital Modernization and Construction."

CHAPTER VIII—LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

Amendment No. 24: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment to provide \$345,000 for "Contingent expenses of the Senate, Inquiries and Investigations" by transfer from another Senate account.

CHAPTER X—DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, AND COMMERCE, THE JUDICIARY AND RELATED AGENCIES

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Amendment No. 25: Appropriates \$500,000 for "Fees and expenses of witnesses" as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 26: Appropriates \$850,000 for "Support of United States prisoners" as proposed by the Senate.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Amendment No. 27: Appropriates \$145,000 for "State marine schools" as proposed by the Senate.

RELATED AGENCIES

Amendment No. 28: Inserts title as proposed by the Senate.

CHAPTER XI—DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Amendment No. 29: Appropriates \$1,000,000 for "Coast Guard, Retired Pay" as proposed by the Senate instead of \$1,250,000 as proposed by the House.

CHAPTER XII—TREASURY DEPARTMENT

Amendment No. 30: Appropriates \$1,300,000 for "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Accounts" as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 31: Appropriates \$3,600,000 for the Bureau of the Public Debt for "Administering the public debt" as proposed by the Senate instead of \$3,250,000 as proposed by the House.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Amendment No. 32: Appropriates \$10,600,000 for "Transportation" as proposed by the Senate instead of \$10,700,000 as proposed by the House.

TAX COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Amendment No. 33: Appropriates \$67,000 for the Tax Court of the United States as proposed by the Senate instead of \$83,000 as proposed by the House.

CHAPTER XIII—CLAIMS AND JUDGMENTS

Amendments Nos. 34 and 35: Appropriate \$23,478,461 for claims and judgments as proposed by the Senate instead of \$6,591,406 as proposed by the House, including those in Senate Document Numbered 91-86.

TITLE II

INCREASED PAY COSTS

Amendment No. 36: Appropriates \$4,495,874 for various Senate items as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 37: Appropriates \$43,475 for "Joint Economic Committee" as proposed by the Senate instead of \$44,490 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 38: Appropriates \$146,300 for "Senate office buildings" and \$3,400 for "Senate garage" as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 39: Appropriates \$502,500,000 for "Military personnel, Air Force" as proposed by the Senate instead of \$485,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 40: Appropriates \$196,480,000 for "Operation and maintenance, Army" as proposed by the House instead of \$206,900,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 41: Appropriates \$157,800,000 for "Operation and maintenance, Navy" as proposed by the House instead of \$166,100,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 42: Appropriates \$70,400,000 for "Operation and maintenance, Defense agencies" as proposed by the House instead of \$74,200,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 43: Appropriates \$13,800,000 for "Operation and maintenance, Army National Guard" as proposed by the House instead of \$14,800,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 44: Appropriates \$3,681,000 for the National Park Service, "Management and protection", as proposed by the Senate instead of \$3,359,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 45: Increases by \$55,000 the limitation on administrative expenses for the Federal Prison Industries, Incorporated, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 46, 47 and 48: Make technical language changes to change the format of items as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 49: Appropriates \$1,940,000 for "United States Secret Service" as proposed by the Senate instead of \$1,740,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 50: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment making \$200,000 for the U.S. Secret Service available upon enactment of H.R. 17138, or similar legislation, with an amendment changing the citation.

Amendment No. 51: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment providing \$42,000 by transfer for "Salaries and expenses" of the Appalachian Regional Commission to cover increased pay costs.

(OUT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FUNDS)

Amendment No. 52: Appropriates \$2,229,000 for "General operating expenses" as proposed by the Senate instead of \$1,932,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 53: Appropriates \$2,324,000 for "Public safety" as proposed by the Senate instead of \$1,780,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 54: Appropriates \$899,000 for "Parks and recreation" as proposed by the Senate instead of \$652,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 55: Appropriates \$4,624,000 for "Health and welfare" as proposed by the Senate instead of \$4,478,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 56: Appropriates \$1,905,000 for "Sanitary engineering" as proposed by the Senate instead of \$1,096,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 57, 58, 59 and 60: Provide that \$12,191,000 shall be paid from the general fund as proposed by the Senate instead of \$10,332,000 as proposed by the House; \$535,000 shall be paid from the highway fund (regular) as proposed by the Senate instead of \$533,000 as proposed by the House; \$468,000 shall be paid from the water fund as proposed by the Senate instead of \$375,000 as proposed by the House; and \$339,000 shall be paid from the sanitary sewage works fund as proposed by the Senate instead of \$250,000 as proposed by the House.

TITLE V

LIMITATION ON FISCAL YEAR 1971 BUDGET OUTLAYS

Amendment No. 61: In connection with the overall government ceiling on fiscal 1971 budget outlays (expenditures and net lending), the House bill contained a \$3,000,000,000 "cushion" for necessary expenditures beyond the estimates in the February 2 budget for certain designated uncontrollables (mainly interest on the debt, the various

social insurance trust funds, and farm price supports). These are some of the items as to which the Congress is not required to act upon annually in the appropriations bills. The Senate raised this "cushion" for uncontrollable overruns to \$6,000,000,000. The conferees have agreed upon \$4,500,000,000.

TITLE VI

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Amendment No. 62: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment in order to validate obligations incurred between July 1, 1970, and 5 days following approval of the act.

GEORGE MAHON,
JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
JOE L. EVINS,
WILLIAM H. NATCHER,
DANIEL J. FLOOD,
TOM STEED,
JULIA BUTLER HANSEN,
CHARLES R. JONAS,
ELFORD CEDERBERG,
ROBERT H. MICHEL,
ODIN LANGEN,

Managers on the Part of the House.



rise? I offer a toast to a man who occupies the most powerful office in the world and in a free society, but at times the most lonely man in the world, when he has to make a momentous decision, because he is the one who has to do it, in his judgment, and in his conscience. Powerful, yes, trust from the people, but lonely when the important decisions are made: The President of the United States.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1970

Mr. MAHON submitted the following conference report on the bill (H.R. 17399) making supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1970, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 91-1227)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 17399) "making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows: That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 6, 14, 23, 40, 41, 42, and 43.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 5, 7, 8, 11, 17, 18, 19, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, and 60, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "\$3,997,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$129,675"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$8,048,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "\$50,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 61: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 61, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$4,500,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 2, 10, 12, 13, 15, 16, 20, 22, 24, 50, 51, and 62.

GEORGE MAHON,
JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
JOE L. EVINS,
WILLIAM H. NATCHER,
DANIEL J. FLOOD,
TOM STEED,
JULIA BUTLER HANSEN,
CHARLES R. JONAS,
ELFORD CEDERBERG,
ROBERT H. MICHEL,
ODIN LANGEN,

Managers on the Part of the House.

ROBERT C. BYRD,
JOHN O. PASTORE,
SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
JOHN STENNIS,
ROMAN L. HRUSKA,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
MARGARET CHASE SMITH,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 17399) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

TITLE I

Chapter I—Department of Agriculture

Amendment No. 1: Provides \$425,000 by transfer for "Extension Service, Cooperative extension work, payments, and expenses" as proposed by the Senate instead of \$597,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 2: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate provision of \$300,000,000 for the "Food Stamp program", with an amendment changing the date for the availability of such funds to cover a four instead of a three-month period of time. Funds so provided are to be charged to the amount provided in the 1971 bill for this purpose, when enacted. The \$300,000,000 does not necessarily have to be prorated over the four month period. These funds are required so that the food stamp program may be continued at about its current level pending enactment of authorizing legislation for the 1971 program, and the regular annual appropriation bill.

Chapter III—District of Columbia

Amendment No. 3: Appropriates \$3,997,000 for "Federal payment to the District of Columbia" instead of \$5,831,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 4: Appropriates \$129,675 for "General operating expenses" instead of \$2,675 as proposed by the House and \$174,675 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 5: Appropriates \$3,966,485 for "Public safety" as proposed by the Senate instead of \$2,370,500 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 6: Deletes appropriation of \$1,789,000 for "Public safety" to assist in meeting costs associated with salary increases for policemen and firemen proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 7: Appropriates \$171,750 for "Parks and recreation" as proposed by the Senate instead of \$47,300 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 8: Appropriates \$20,000 for "Settlement of claims and suits" as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 9: Appropriates \$8,048,000 for "Capital outlay" instead of \$1,658,000 as proposed by the House and \$8,768,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 10: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment to provide that \$318,000 shall be available for construction services instead of \$374,500 as proposed by the Senate.

Chapter V—Independent offices

Amendment No. 11: Appropriates \$157,816,600 for "Payment to Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund" as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 12: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment to appropriate \$371,000 for the General Services Administration for sites and expenses of a public buildings project at Aberdeen, Mississippi.

Amendment No. 13: Reported in disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to insist on disagreement to the amendment of the Senate which proposes to appropriate an additional \$8,800,000 for the National Science Foundation for fiscal year 1970.

Amendment No. 14: Appropriates \$7,000,000 for the "Selective Service System" as proposed by the House instead of \$7,433,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 15: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to appropriate \$350,000 for the "Council on Environmental Quality and Office of Environmental Quality," instead of \$100,000 as proposed by the House and \$400,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Department of Housing and Urban Development

Amendment No. 16: Reported in disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to insist on disagreement to the amendment of the Senate which proposes to appropriate an additional \$587,500,000 for Urban Renewal Programs for fiscal year 1970.

Chapter VI—Department of the Interior

Amendment No. 17: Appropriates \$225,000 for "Geological Survey, surveys, investigations, and research" as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 18: Appropriates \$775,000 for "National Park Service, Management and Protection" as proposed by the Senate instead of \$850,000 as proposed by the House.
Department of Agriculture

Amendment No. 19: Appropriates \$21,172,000 for "Forest Protection and Utilization, Forest Land Management" as proposed by the Senate instead of \$21,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 20: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur with the Senate amendment which provides \$172,000 of funds appropriated for "Forest Land Management" shall remain available until expended.

Chapter VII—Department of Labor

Amendment No. 21: Appropriates \$50,000,000 for "Manpower development and training activities" instead of \$100,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 22: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment to appropriate \$2,330,000 for "Trade Adjustment Activities."

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

Amendment No. 23: Deletes item proposed by the Senate to appropriate \$8,703,078 for "Hospital Modernization and Construction".

Chapter VIII—Legislative Branch

Amendment No. 24: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment to provide \$345,000 for "Contingent expenses of the Senate, inquiries and investigations" by transfer from another Senate account.

Chapter X—Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the judiciary, and related agencies

Department of Justice

Amendment No. 25: Appropriates \$500,000 for "Fees and expenses of witnesses" as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 26: Appropriates \$850,000 for "Support of United States prisoners" as proposed by the Senate.

Department of Commerce

Amendment No. 27: Appropriates \$145,000 for "State marine schools" as proposed by the Senate.

Related Agencies

Amendment No. 28: Inserts title as proposed by the Senate.

Chapter XI—Department of Transportation

Amendment No. 29: Appropriates \$1,000,000 for "Coast Guard, Retired Pay" as proposed by the Senate instead of \$1,250,000 as proposed by the House.

Chapter XII—Treasury Department

Amendment No. 30: Appropriates \$1,300,000 for "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Accounts" as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 31: Appropriates \$3,600,000 for the Bureau of the Public Debt for "Administering the public debt" as proposed by the Senate instead of \$3,250,000 as proposed by the House.

Post Office Department

Amendment No. 32: Appropriates \$10,600,000 for "Transportation" as proposed by the Senate instead of \$10,700,000 as proposed by the House.

Tax Court of the United States

Amendment No. 33: Appropriates \$87,000 for the Tax Court of the United States as proposed by the Senate instead of \$83,000 as proposed by the House.

Chapter XIII—Claims and judgments

Amendments Nos. 34 and 35: Appropriate \$23,478,461 for claims and judgments as pro-

posed by the Senate instead of \$6,591,406 as proposed by the House, including those in Senate Document Numbered 91-86.

TITLE II

Increased pay costs

Amendment No. 36: Appropriates \$4,495,874 for various Senate items as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 37: Appropriates \$43,475, for "Joint Economic Committee" as proposed by the Senate instead of \$44,490 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 38: Appropriates \$146,300 for "Senate office buildings" and \$3,400 for "Senate garage" as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 39: Appropriates \$502,500,000 for "Military personnel, Air Force" as proposed by the Senate instead of \$485,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 40: Appropriates \$196,480,000 for "Operation and maintenance, Army" as proposed by the House instead of \$206,900,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 41: Appropriates \$157,800,000 for "Operation and maintenance, Navy" as proposed by the House instead of \$166,100,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 42: Appropriates \$70,400,000 for "Operations and maintenance, Defense agencies" as proposed by the House instead of \$74,200,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 43: Appropriates \$13,800,000 for "Operation and maintenance, Army National Guard" as proposed by the House instead of \$14,800,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 44: Appropriates \$3,681,000 for the National Park Service, "Management and protection", as proposed by the Senate instead of \$3,359,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 45: Increase by \$55,000 the limitation on administrative expenses for the Federal Prison Industries, Incorporated, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 46, 47 and 48: Make technical language changes to change the format of items as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 49: Appropriates \$1,940,000 for "United States Secret Service" as proposed by the Senate instead of \$1,740,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 50: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment making \$200,000 for the U.S. Secret Service available upon enactment of H.R. 17138, or similar legislation, with an amendment changing the citation.

Amendment No. 51: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment providing \$42,000 by transfer for "Salaries and expenses" of the Appalachian Regional Commission to cover increased pay costs.

(Out of District of Columbia Funds)

Amendment No. 52: Appropriates \$2,229,000 for "General operating expenses" as proposed by the Senate instead of \$1,932,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 53: Appropriates \$2,324,000 for "Public safety" as proposed by the Senate instead of \$1,780,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 54: Appropriates \$899,000 for "Parks and recreation" as proposed by the Senate instead of \$652,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 55: Appropriates \$4,624,000 for "Health and welfare" as proposed by the Senate instead of \$4,478,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 56: Appropriates \$1,905,000 for "Sanitary engineering" as proposed by the Senate instead of \$1,096,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 57, 58, 59, and 60: Pro-

vide that \$12,191,000 shall be paid from the general fund as proposed by the Senate instead of \$10,332,000 as proposed by the House; \$535,000 shall be paid from the highway fund (regular) as proposed by the Senate instead of \$533,000 as proposed by the House; \$488,000 shall be paid from the water fund as proposed by the Senate instead of \$375,000 as proposed by the House; and \$339,000 shall be paid from the sanitary sewage works fund as proposed by the Senate instead of \$250,000 as proposed by the House.

TITLE V

Limitation on fiscal year 1971 budget outlays

Amendment No. 61: In connection with the overall government ceiling on fiscal 1971 budget outlays (expenditures and net lending), the House bill contained a \$3,000,000,000 "cushion" for necessary expenditures beyond the estimates in the February 2 budget for certain designated uncontrollables (mainly interest on the debt, the various social insurance trust funds, and farm price supports). These are some of the items as to which the Congress is not required to act upon annually in the appropriations bills. The Senate raised this "cushion" for uncontrollable overruns to \$6,000,000,000. The conferees have agreed upon \$4,500,000,000.

TITLE VI

General provisions

Amendment No. 62: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment in order to validate obligations incurred between July 1, 1970, and 5 days following approval of the act.

GEORGE MAHON,
JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
JOE L. EVINS,
WILLIAM H. NATCHER,
DANIEL J. FLOOD,
TOM STEED,
JULIA BUTLER HANSEN,
CHARLES R. JONAS,
ELFORD CEDERBERG,
ROBERT H. MICHEL,
ODIN LANGEN,

Managers on the Part of the House.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CAREY (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for the week of June 22, on account of family illness.

Mr. WATKINS, for June 25, on account of a personal obligation of 50 years standing.

Mr. FINDLEY, from June 27 to July 1, 1970, on account of official business to attend North Atlantic Assembly committee meetings.

Mr. ASPINALL, from 3 p.m., June 26, 1970, until July 14, 1970, on account of official business from June 26 until July 10 and personal matters from July 10 to July 14.

Mr. WIGGINS (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for June 25 and the balance of the week on account of official business as a member of the House Committee on Crime conducting hearings in New York.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the re-

DIGEST of Congressional Proceedings

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(FOR INFORMATION ONLY;
NOT TO BE QUOTED OR CITED)

For actions of June 25, 1970
91st-2nd; No. 106

CONTENTS

Adjournment.....5	Farm Program.....7	Personnel.....22
Agricultural Appropriations..6	Federal Aid.....21	Public Works.....20
Air Pollution.....15	Housing.....3	Reorganization.....23
Appropriations.....1, 6, 29	Inflation.....28	Research.....18
Conservation.....4	Lands.....16	Tariffs.....9
Consumers.....11	L-Dopa.....9	Tobacco.....12
Electrification.....24	Meat Inspection....2, 8	Water.....17
Employment Act.....19	Migrants.....26	Wheat.....25
Environment.....10, 13	National Forest.....14	Wildlife.....27

HIGHLIGHTS: House agreed to conference report on second supplemental appropriations bill. Senate Appropriations subcommittee approved agricultural appropriations bill. Both Houses received GAO report on meat inspection. Rep. Melcher discussed report and Sen. Bellmon submitted resolution to study meat inspection. Sen. Harris urged action on the coalition farm bill.

HOUSE

1. APPROPRIATIONS. Agreed to the conference report on HR 17399, the second supplemental appropriations bill, FY 70. pp. H6040-6050

2. MEAT INSPECTION. Both Houses received a GAO report on meat inspection; to the Government Operations Committees. pp. H6117, S9799

Rep. Melcher stated we are not going to compromise our inspection standards of imported meats and inserted an article noting American investors are trying to "gobble up" pasturage lands in Australia. pp. H6095-6

3. HOUSING. Passed with amendments HR 17495, the proposed Emergency Home Finance Act of 1970. pp. H6050-6092
4. CONSERVATION. An Interior and Insular Affairs Committee subcommittee approved for full committee consideration HR 12870 amended, providing for the establishment of the King Range National Conservation Area, California. p. D689
5. ADJOURNED until Monday, June 29.

SENATE

6. APPROPRIATIONS. An Appropriations Committee subcommittee approved for full committee consideration with amendments HR 17923, the FY 71 agricultural appropriations bill. p. D686
Passed with amendments HR 16916, the FY 71 appropriations bill for the Office of Education. pp. S9891-929
7. FARM PROGRAM. Sen. Harris discussed the need for new farm legislation, urged enactment of the coalition farm bill, and inserted statements from Oklahoma wheat farmers in support of that bill. pp. S9827-33
8. MEAT INSPECTION. Sen. Bellmon discussed the GAO report on meat inspection and introduced S. Con. Res. 73, to establish a joint Congressional committee to carry out a study and investigation of the Federal Meat Inspection Act. pp. S9802-
9. TARIFFS. Passed HR 8512, providing for the suspension for a temporary period of the import duty on L-Dopa. This bill now goes to the President. pp. S9793-4
10. ENVIRONMENT. Passed without amendment S. 4012, extending the Clean Air Act and the Solid Waste Disposal Act for 60 days. p. S9794

BILLS INTRODUCED

11. CONSUMERS. H. R. 18214, by Rep. Rosenthal; to establish an Office of Consumer Affairs in the Executive Office of the President and a Consumer Protection Agency in order to secure within the Federal Government effective protection and representation of the interests of consumers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.
12. TOBACCO. H. R. 18232, by Rep. Broyhill (N. C.); to authorize the lease and transfer of Burley acreage allotments; to the Committee on Agriculture.
13. ENVIRONMENT. H. R. 18242, by Rep. Tunney; to amend the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 to establish an Environmental Action Corps and an Environmental Legal Services Office under the direction of the Council on Environmental Quality, and to create the Office of Environmental Ombudsman; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.
14. NATIONAL FOREST. S. 4028, by Sen. Moss; to authorize and direct the acquisition of certain lands within the boundaries of the Wasatch National Forest in the State of Utah by the Secretary of Agriculture; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. Remarks of author p. S9949

am sorry I will not be here next year, when he will continue as minority leader—I admire and respect him very much—he is a dear friend of mine—the gentleman from Michigan said that a vote today sustaining the veto is a reaffirmation of the bill that was passed by the House.

That, in my opinion, does not convey the whole story, because after the bill passed the House, the Senate amended it and the bill went to conference. The conferees brought back their report, and what we shall vote on today is the very bill in that conference report. So our vote will determine whether or not we will reaffirm the vote on the conference report, as I see it, and not on the bill as it passed the House.

In connection with health, there seems to be some great evil in the minds of a few—I withdraw the word "evil" for that is not correct and it would be wrong to use that word. I always like to be fair, even when I have strong views. But in the minds of some there seems to be a sinister connotation when the word "mandatory" is used in connection with a bill of the kind we are discussing.

Might I call the attention of my colleagues to the fact that we have passed mandatory provisions before. This is nothing new. We passed mandatory provisions in the field of education and they are on the statute books now. While I have the greatest respect for the importance of education, though not for the small percentage of those engaged in campus disorders, I believe that health is of even greater importance than education, and that is a matter of major importance. So if it is all right to provide mandatory provisions in the field of education, certainly it is all right, in this limited amount, to carry the mandatory provisions into the field of health—the building of hospitals, providing for the elderly, and all the other categories that are covered by the Hill-Burton Act.

I come back to my previous statement agreeing with my dear friend from Illinois that this is not a partisan question. Certainly an issue is involved. To me it seems to be whether we are going to vote for dollar values today or for human values, and that has been the time-honored fight that I have carried on during the 42 years that I have been a Member of the Congress of the United States. Only a few weeks ago the conference report was before the House and a rollcall was asked for; 377 Members, Democrats and Republicans, voted for the conference report. My friends on the Republican side voted for the report that is before us today.

I wonder if my dear friend from Michigan and my dear friend from Illinois were consulted by the President before the fact? I am not criticizing the President. I would never do that. I might disagree, but I will never impugn the motives not only of the President but any of my colleagues. I can disagree without impugning. But I know if a Democratic President were considering this bill and he asked the Democratic Leadership to come down to discuss it with him, I would holler vigorously and oppose vigorously any proposed veto of such a meri-

torious bill. And, without knowing the facts, I have every confidence, by inference, that if the gentleman from Michigan and the gentleman from Illinois were called down to the White House, they would have urged President Nixon not to veto this bill.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Will the House, on reconsideration, pass the bill, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding?

Under the Constitution, this vote must be determined by the yeas and nays.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 279, nays 98, answered "present" 2, not voting 50, as follows:

[Roll No. 188]

YEAS—279

Abbutt	Evins, Tenn.	Macdonald,
Abernethy	Fallon	Mass.
Adams	Fascell	Madden
Addabbo	Feighan	Mahon
Albert	Flood	Mailliard
Anderson,	Flynt	Martin
Calif.	Foley	Mathias
Andrews, Ala.	Ford,	Matsunaga
Annunzio	William D.	Meeds
Ashbrook	Fountain	Melcher
Ashley	Fraser	Mikva
Aspinall	Friedel	Miller, Calif.
Baring	Fulton, Pa.	Miller, Ohio
Barrett	Fulton, Tenn.	Mills
Beall, Md.	Fuqua	Minish
Bennett	Galifianakis	Mink
Bevil	Gallagher	Minshall
Biaggi	Garmatz	Mize
Biester	Gettys	Mohagan
Bingham	Gibbons	Moorhead
Blanton	Goldwater	Morgan
Blatnik	Gonzalez	Mosher
Boggs	Gray	Moss
Boland	Green, Oreg.	Murphy, Ill.
Bolling	Green, Pa.	Murphy, N.Y.
Brademas	Giffin	Myers
Brasco	Griffiths	Natcher
Brinkley	Gross	Nedzi
Brooks	Gubser	Nichols
Broomfield	Gude	Nix
Brotzman	Hagan	Obey
Brown, Calif.	Haley	O'Hara
Brown, Mich.	Halpern	O'Konski
Broyhill, N.C.	Hammer-	Olsen
Buchanan	schmidt	O'Neal, Ga.
Burke, Mass.	Hanley	O'Neill, Mass.
Burleson, Tex.	Hanna	Ottinger
Burlison, Mo.	Hansen, Wash.	Passman
Burton, Calif.	Harrington	Patman
Button	Hathaway	Patten
Byrne, Pa.	Hays	Pelly
Cabell	Hebert	Perkins
Casey	Hechler, W. Va.	Pettis
Celler	Helstoski	Philbin
Chamberlain	Henderson	Pickle
Chappell	Hicks	Pike
Chisholm	Hogan	Pirnie
Clark	Hollifield	Poage
Clausen,	Horton	Podell
Don H.	Howard	Preyer, N.C.
Clawson, Del.	Hull	Price, Ill.
Clay	Hungate	Pryor, Ark.
Cleveland	Hunt	Pucinski
Cohelan	Ichord	Purcell
Conable	Jacobs	Randall
Conte	Johnson, Calif.	Rarick
Conyers	Jones, Ala.	Rees
Corbett	Jones, N.C.	Reid, N.Y.
Corman	Jones, Tenn.	Reuss
Cowger	Karth	Rivers
Culver	Kastenmeier	Roberts
Daniel, Va.	Kazen	Rodino
Davis, Ga.	Kee	Roe
Delaney	King	Rogers, Colo.
Dellenback	Kluczynski	Rogers, Fla.
Diggs	Koch	Rooney, N.Y.
Dingell	Kyros	Rooney, Pa.
Donohue	Landrum	Rosenthal
Dorn	Latta	Rostenkowski
Dowdy	Leggett	Roth
Downing	Lennon	Roudebush
Dulski	Long, La.	Roybal
Duncan	Lowenstein	Ruth
Dwyer	McCarthy	Ryan
Eckhardt	McCulloch	St Germain
Edmondson	McDade	Sandman
Edwards, Calif.	McDonald,	Satterfield
Edwards, La.	Mich.	Saylor
Eilberg	McFall	Schadeberg
Evans, Colo.	McMillan	Scherle

Scheuer	Stubblefield	Watts
Sebelius	Stuckey	Weicker
Shipley	Sullivan	Whalen
Shriver	Symington	White
Sikes	Talcott	Whitehurst
Sisk	Taylor	Whitten
Skubitz	Thompson, N.J.	Winn
Slack	Tunney	Wood
Smith, Calif.	Udall	Wolff
Snyder	Ullman	Wright
Staggers	Van Deerin	Wyman
Steed	Vanik	Yates
Stephens	Vigorito	Yatron
Stokes	Waggoner	Young
Stratton	Waldie	Zablocki

NAYS—98

Anderson, Ill.	Findley	Morton
Andrews,	Fish	Nelsen
N. Dak.	Fisher	Poff
Arends	Ford, Gerald R.	Quie
Belcher	Foreman	Quillen
Bell, Calif.	Frelinghuysen	Reid, Ill.
Berry	Goodling	Reifel
Betts	Grover	Rhodes
Blackburn	Harsha	Ruppe
Bray	Harvey	Schneebeli
Brock	Heckler, Mass.	Schwengel
Brown, Ohio	Hosmer	Scott
Brownhill, Va.	Hutchinson	Smith, N.Y.
Burke, Fla.	Johnson, Pa.	Springer
Burton, Utah	Jonas	Stafford
Byrnes, Wis.	Kleppe	Stanton
Camp	Landgrebe	Steiger, Ariz.
Carter	Langen	Steiger, Wis.
Cederberg	Lloyd	Taft
Collier	Lujan	Teague, Calif.
Collins	Lukens	Thompson, Ga.
Colmer	McClory	Thompson, Wis.
Coughlin	McCloskey	Vander Jagt
Crane	McClure	Wampler
Cunningham	McEwen	Whalley
Davis, Wis.	McKneally	Widnall
Denney	MacGregor	Williams
Dennis	Marsh	Wilson, Bob
Derwinski	May	Wyatt
Devine	Mayne	Wydler
Dickinson	Michel	Wylie
Edwards, Ala.	Mizell	Zion
Eshleman	Morse	Zwach

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Kuykendall

Kyl

NOT VOTING—50

Adair	Farbstein	Montgomery
Alexander	Flowers	Pepper
Anderson,	Frey	Pollock
Tenn.	Gaydos	Powell
Ayres	Gialimo	Price, Tex.
Bow	Gilbert	Railsback
Bush	Hall	Riegle
Caffery	Hamilton	Robison
Carey	Hansen, Idaho	Smith, Iowa
Clancy	Hastings	Teague, Tex.
Cramer	Hawkins	Tiernan
Daddario	Jarman	Watkins
Daniels, N.J.	Keith	Watson
Dawson	Kirwan	Wiggins
de la Garza	Long, Md.	Wilson,
Dent	Mann	Charles H.
Erlenborn	Meskill	
Esch	Mollohan	

So, two-thirds having voted in favor thereof, the bill was passed, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Kyl and Mr. Pollock for, with Mr. Bush against.

Mr. Kuykendall and Mr. Smith of Iowa for, with Mr. Bow against.

Mr. Flowers and Mr. Caffery for, with Mr. Cramer against.

Mr. Riegle and Mr. Tiernan for, with Mr. Long of Indiana against.

Mr. Pepper and Mr. de la Garza for, with Mr. Price of Texas against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Daddario with Mr. Meskill.

Mr. Carey with Mr. Hastings.

Mr. Mann with Mr. Hall.

Mr. Daniels of New Jersey with Mr. Robison.

Mr. Alexander with Mr. Adair.

Mr. Dent with Mr. Watkins.
 Mr. Gaydos with Mr. Rallsback.
 Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Clancy.
 Mr. Gilbert with Mr. Wiggins.
 Mr. Giaimo with Mr. Ayres.
 Mr. Montgomery with Mr. Watson.
 Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Esch.
 Mr. Anderson of Tennessee with Mr. Hansen of Idaho.

Mr. Jarman with Mr. Frey.
 Mr. Molloy with Mr. Erlenborn.
 Mr. Hamilton with Mr. Keith.
 Mr. Farstein with Mr. Hawkins.
 Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Powell.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BUSH). If he were present, he would vote "nay." I voted "yea." I therefore, withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Bow). If he were present, he would vote "nay." I voted "yea." I therefore, withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. BUCHANAN changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will notify the Senate of the action of the House.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks after the vote just taken, and also to include extraneous material.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

THE PRESIDENTIAL VETO— PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, the able gentleman from California, the Honorable CHARLES E. WIGGINS, and I were in New York this morning where hearings of the House Select Committee on Crime began on the subject of drug traffic and organized crime's involvement in it. To be able to get to the House so as to vote on the bill extending Federal aid for hospital construction—the Hill-Burton Act—vetoed by the President, we adjourned the hearing at 11:30 a.m. and would have been here in ample time to vote had not our plane sat on the runway at LaGuardia Airport for 45 minutes. That delay

prevented us reaching the floor of the House until 7 minutes after completion of the vote on the veto message.

Had I been present I would have voted to override the President's veto and to pass this most meritorious bill.

I was one of the sponsors of this bill in the Senate when it was first enacted. Its enactment was first recommended by the Senate Committee on Wartime Health and Education of which I was chairman and Senator Hill was a member of my Wartime Health and Education Committee.

I think this measure has immeasurably contributed to the health and happiness of countless numbers of people of this country and immensely helped to further the well-being of our Nation. I am glad to see the House by an almost 3-to-1 vote adhere to its previous position reporting this bill notwithstanding the veto of the President.

I did have a live pair in case I did not get back in time for the vote so that my vote counted in overriding the veto as if I had been here and voted.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that this statement appear in the body of the RECORD immediately following the vote on the veto message.

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1970

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 17399) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of June 24, 1970.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOLIFIELD). The gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON) is recognized.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

SUMMARY OF THE AMOUNTS INVOLVED

Mr. Speaker, this is the conference report on the second supplemental appropriation bill which passed the House on May 7. As it now stands, the bill

contains about \$6 billion in new budget obligational authority. The largest single item in the bill relates to statutory pay increases for military and civilian personnel—about \$4.3 billion. There are other items included, but pay costs are the single largest item of cost.

The budget estimates which were submitted to the House in connection with the bill total \$5.9 billion.

The budget estimates considered by the Senate total nearly \$6.6 billion. Some \$662 million in the budget estimates were not considered by the House; they were sent by the executive directly to the Senate after the bill passed the House.

The House-passed bill provided \$5.7 billion, plus.

The Senate approved \$6.7 billion. The Senate bill exceeds the House bill by \$938 million.

I include a summary of the totals:

Summary of conference report on second supplemental bill, 1970 new budget (obligational) authority

Budget estimates to the House	\$5,918,073,131
Budget estimates to the Senate	6,580,171,902

Estimates not considered by House	+662,098,771
---	--------------

Passed House	5,764,115,791
Passed Senate	6,702,375,083

Senate over House	+938,259,292
-------------------------	--------------

Conference action (that is, excluding the two amendments in disagreement)	6,021,535,005
---	---------------

Conference action compared to—

Budget estimates (cut includes \$275 million for military credit sales and \$150 million for emergency school assistance) ..	—558,636,897
House bill	+257,419,214
Senate bill (cut reflects omission of \$8.8 million on National Science Foundation, Amendment No. 13, and \$587.5 million in amendment No. 16 for urban renewal programs)	—680,840,078

Mr. Speaker, these are the summary figures on new budget—obligational authority—or, in other words, new appropriations. There are many transfers, and some additional contracting authorities for housing programs that are not added into these totals but which are in some respects significant. I include a more detailed itemization of the figures:

SUMMARY STATEMENT OF CONFERENCE ACTION—SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1970 (H.R. 17399)

Chapter No.	Department of activity	Budget estimate	House bill	Senate bill	Conference action	Conference action compared with—		
						Budget estimate	House bill	Senate bill
TITLE I—GENERAL SUPPLEMENTALS								
I	Agriculture:							
	Temporary appropriation—1971.....			(\$300,000,000)	(\$300,000,000)	(+\$300,000,000)	(+\$300,000,000)
	By transfer.....	(\$597,000)	(\$597,000)	(425,000)	(425,000)	(-172,000)	(-172,000)
II	Defense:							
	New budget (obligational) authority.....	99,000,000	99,000,000	99,000,000	99,000,000
III	District of Columbia:							
	Federal funds: New budget (obligational) authority.....	7,124,000	1,293,000	7,124,000	5,290,000	-1,834,000	+3,997,000	-\$1,834,000
	District of Columbia Funds.....	(21,466,000)	(4,078,475)	(13,100,910)	(12,335,910)	(-9,130,090)	(+8,257,435)	(-765,000)
IV	Foreign Assistance:							
	New budget (obligational) authority.....	480,880,000	205,880,000	205,880,000	205,880,000	-275,000,000
	Increase in limitation.....	(349,000)	(-349,000)

Chapter No.	Department of activity	Budget estimate	House bill	Senate bill	Conference action	Conference action compared with—		
						Budget estimate	House bill	Senate bill
V	Independent offices—Housing and Urban Development:							
	New budget (obligational) authority:							
	1969	\$13,616,000	\$13,616,000	\$13,616,000	\$13,616,000			
	1970	984,198,000	797,110,000	1,552,330,000	2 955,547,600	\$-28,651,000	+\$158,437,600	-\$596,783,000
	Total	997,814,600	810,726,000	1,565,946,600	696,163,600	-28,651,000	+158,437,600	-596,783,000
	New annual contract authorizations, increase in limitations	(55,500,000)	(75,000,000)	(75,000,000)	(75,000,000)	(+19,500,000)		
VI	Interior: New budget (obligational) authority	56,015,000	55,715,000	56,037,000	56,037,000	+22,000	+322,000	
VII	Labor-Health, Education, and Welfare:							
	New budget (obligational) authority	406,980,000	204,597,000	315,630,078	256,927,000	-150,053,000	+52,330,000	-58,703,078
	By transfer	(43,000)	(43,000)	(43,000)	(43,000)			
	Limitation (trust fund—Administrative expenses)	(10,000,000)	(10,000,000)	(10,000,000)	(10,000,000)			
VIII	Legislative branch:							
	New budget (obligational) authority	1,131,555	731,555	731,555	731,555	-400,000		
	By transfer			(345,000)	(345,000)	(+345,000)	(+345,000)	
IX	Public works:							
	By transfer	(6,563,000)	(6,563,000)	(6,563,000)	(6,563,000)			
X	State, Justice, Commerce, and Judiciary:							
	New budget (obligational) authority:							
	1969	300,000	300,000	300,000	300,000			
	1970	28,776,500	21,330,000	22,825,000	22,825,000	-5,951,500	+1,495,000	
	Total	29,076,500	21,630,000	23,125,000	23,125,000	-5,951,500	+1,495,000	
XI	Transportation:							
	New budget (obligational) authority	84,189,000	84,189,000	83,939,000	83,939,000	-250,000	-250,000	
XII	Treasury-Post Office:							
	New budget (obligational) authority	15,703,000	14,033,000	15,567,000	15,567,000	-136,000	-1,534,000	
XIII	Claims and judgments:							
	New budget (obligational) authority	23,478,461	6,591,406	23,478,461	23,478,461		+16,887,055	
	Total Title I:							
	New budget (obligational) authority:							
	1969	13,916,000	13,916,000	13,916,000	13,916,000			
	1970	2,187,476,116	1,490,469,961	2,382,542,694	2 1,725,222,616	-462,253,500	+234,752,655	-657,320,078
	Total	2,201,392,116	1,504,385,961	2,396,458,694	2 1,739,138,616	-462,253,500	+234,752,655	-657,320,078
	By transfer	(7,203,000)	(7,203,000)	(7,376,000)	(7,376,000)	(+173,000)	(+173,000)	
	Limitation increases (administrative expenses)	(10,349,000)	(10,000,000)	(10,000,000)	(10,000,000)	(-349,000)		
	New annual contract authorizations, increase in limitations	(55,500,000)	(75,000,000)	(75,000,000)	(75,000,000)	(+19,500,000)		
	Temporary appropriation, 1971			(300,000,000)	(300,000,000)	(+300,000,000)	(+300,000,000)	
	TITLE II							
	Increased pay costs:							
	New budget (obligational) authority	3,028,779,786	2,909,729,830	2,955,916,389	2,932,396,389	-96,383,397	+22,666,559	-23,520,000
	By transfer	(42,263,000)	(42,181,900)	(42,223,900)	(42,223,900)	(-39,100)	(+42,000)	
	Limitations on administrative and non-administrative expenses	(37,927,000)	(36,225,700)	(36,280,700)	(36,280,700)	(-1,646,300)	(+55,000)	
	TITLE III							
	Increased pay costs—Federal Employees Salary Act of 1970 (indefinite)	1 1,350,000,000	1 1,350,000,000	1 1,350,000,000	1 1,350,000,000			
	Recapitulation: Grand total, titles I, II, and III:							
	New Budget (obligational) authority:							
	1969	13,916,000	13,916,000	13,916,000	13,916,000			
	1970 definite	5,216,255,902	4,400,199,791	5,338,459,083	2 4,657,619,005	-558,636,897	+257,419,214	-680,840,078
	1970 indefinite	1 1,350,000,000	1 1,350,000,000	1 1,350,000,000	1 1,350,000,000			
	Total	6,580,171,902	5,764,115,791	6,702,375,083	2 6,021,535,005	-558,636,897	+257,419,214	-680,840,078
	By transfer	(49,466,000)	(49,384,900)	(49,599,900)	(49,599,900)	(+133,900)	(+215,000)	
	Limitations on administrative and non-administrative expenses	(48,276,000)	(46,225,700)	(46,280,700)	(46,280,700)	(-1,995,300)	(+55,000)	
	New annual contract authorizations, increase in limitations	(55,500,000)	(75,000,000)	(75,000,000)	(75,000,000)	(+19,500,000)		
	Temporary appropriation—1971			(300,000,000)	(300,000,000)	(+300,000,000)	(+300,000,000)	

¹ Estimate of cost for the 6 months the 6 percent retroactive pay bill would be in effect during fiscal 1970. Under the bill language, transfers of certain unobligated balances are authorized to help meet the added costs, and some absorptions otherwise are probable. Thus, the aggregate additional appropriation under this provision may actually be less than \$1,350,000,000. Note.—In terms of the February budget aggregates for 1970, the net additional amount is \$1,175,000,000,

after taking account of the \$175,000,000 allowances in the February budget total related to a postal pay raise.

² Senate amendments, No. 13 to provide \$8.8 million for the National Science Foundation and No. 16 to provide \$587.5 million for Urban Renewal Programs, are reported in disagreement and are, therefore, excluded from the conference action totals.

AMENDMENTS IN DISAGREEMENT

The main controversy in this bill concerns the sum of \$587.5 million for additional funds for urban renewal added on the floor of the other body. It is unbudgeted. When we reach that amendment following the adoption of the conference report itself, I would assume that there will be some discussion, and I will at that time discuss in some detail the additional sum added by the Senate and opposed by the House, and which is brought back in disagree-

ment by the House. It is amendment No. 16.

Amendment No. 13, concerning the National Science Foundation, is also in disagreement.

If Members want to have a thumbnail statement as to just what is involved in the amendment concerning urban renewal, which will be discussed after adoption of the conference report, copies of the amendment and a statement as to the facts are here on the committee table

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, the conference report was signed by all representatives of the House after a full and extensive conference. I support the conference report and urge its adoption.

We will discuss the items in controversy when we get to the motions of the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RYAN).

(Mr. RYAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I am especially concerned about two amendments. No. 16, which I understand will be the subject of discussion when we reach the amendments which are in disagreement, relates to urban renewal. I urge the House to recede and concur in the Senate amendment No. 16 which will provide an additional \$587.5 million to fully fund the urban renewal program.

FUNDS FOR SUMMER JOBS FOR YOUTH

I am also concerned about amendment No. 21, which is not in disagreement and which would appropriate \$50 million for manpower development and training activities. This is 50 percent of the amount proposed by the Senate, which was \$100 million. This is intended for the Neighborhood Youth Corps summer program.

That is a summer program which is of dire importance to our major urban areas, where teenagers without this program simply have no opportunity for any gainful employment during the summer. Thousands of young men and women will be forced to spend the summer in idleness without the wages needed to sustain themselves and their families.

The \$100 million which the Senate included in this bill would have provided, I believe, 227,000 slots for jobs in the summertime, which means that this bill, at the rate of \$50 million, would provide approximately half of that, or 114,000 slots.

Teenage unemployment is disastrous—twice that of adult unemployment. In the black communities teenage unemployment stood at the rate of 32.7 percent in April. Young men and women must have the chance to help themselves.

I do want to express my disappointment that the House conferees did not accept the full amount which the Senate had proposed. In fact, I previously introduced H.R. 18068 to provide \$100 million additional for the Neighborhood Youth Corps.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman refers to amendment No. 21. The other body added \$50 million above the President's request for summer jobs for youths. The administration advised that probably \$50 million could be used for summer jobs, and sent up a budget request for the \$50 million.

What the conferees did was to agree to the \$50 million budget request made by the President. At this period of the year, in view of the delay in the passage of this bill, it seemed to the conferees that perhaps not even \$50 million can be used. Nevertheless, we did provide the total budget estimate of \$50 million.

Mr. RYAN. Let me assure the chairman that the \$50 million can and will be used. As a matter of fact, we could use the total amount in the city of New York right now.

CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT SUPPLEMENTED

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Do I correctly understand that the administration's supplemental budget figure was \$5.9 billion?

Mr. MAHON. The House considered budget estimates involving \$5.9 billion. Additional budget estimates were sent directly to the Senate after the House acted. So, budget requests considered in this bill total nearly \$6.6 billion.

Mr. GROSS. And was the amount, whatever it was, for the Civil Service Commission included in that figure?

Mr. MAHON. The amount for the Civil Service Commission, to strengthen the retirement fund, was not before the House, but it was added in the other body based upon a budget estimate. The total amount involved is about \$157 million.

Mr. GROSS. \$157 million?

Mr. MAHON. Yes; as authorized by recently enacted legislation.

Mr. GROSS. And that was a budget figure, again, from the administration?

Mr. MAHON. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. This bill is how much above the House figure?

Mr. MAHON. This conference bill is above the House figure by \$938 million, but I must say that the other body considered \$662 million of estimates which were not before the House.

URBAN RENEWAL ADDITION BY SENATE

Mr. GROSS. The \$587 million for urban renewal which is in disagreement is not a part of the figure the gentleman just gave, or is it?

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is correct; it is not in the budget requests because it was not requested. It is not in the conference total, of course. This was added on the Senate floor. We will have a discussion of that when we come to amendment No. 16, following adoption of the conference report.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding to me and for his explanations.

Mr. MAHON. I would say to the gentleman, that of course the \$587.5 million is in the Senate passed total.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JONAS. I was just going to make that point. The \$587 million that will be discussed later is included in the \$938 million figure, which shows in the bill as it passed the Senate above our figure.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. COHELAN. Will the gentleman explain today a little more about amendment No. 16 reported in disagreement with respect to this \$587 million? Do I understand you are going to explain it to us now, or when will you?

Mr. MAHON. As I indicated, we propose to discuss that when we reach amendment No. 16 on a separate motion after the conference report itself is adopted.

Mr. COHELAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, during the Senate debate on this supplemental appropriation bill for 1970, the Senate adopted an amendment proposed by Senator PROXMIER of Wisconsin to add \$8.7 million in funds to help complete the construction of 35 hospitals throughout the country. These hospitals were hurt particularly hard when the Congress voted last year, at the insistence of the President, to cut by \$82 million the appropriation for hospital construction and modernization under the Hill-Burton program.

With that cutback in funds there has been a halt in the construction of some hospitals which are already in various phases of construction. In some cases, contractors may not be paid, and in many local communities they are finding it necessary to obtain funds in other ways to refinance these projects.

The Proxmire amendment would have helped those local communities which have already started construction or modernization projects, which have been led to believe they would receive funds, and which have been counting on these funds during the 1970 fiscal year so that the projects could proceed and in some cases be completed.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, that amendment was not accepted by the House in the conference committee. I regret that decision. The Proxmire amendment was passed by the Senate in an attempt to fulfill the promise on the part of the Federal Government to provide a certain level of assistance to local communities for hospital construction in this fiscal year. By not accepting this amendment Congress has let these communities down. I believe this bill would have been a far better piece of legislation had it contained that amendment.

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the people in the area of Beloit I express regret that the conferees saw fit to delete the item of \$8,703,078 for hospital modernization and construction which I had attempted unsuccessfully to have included in the House version of the second supplemental appropriation bill of 1970 but which was included in the Senate version.

While I can understand the action of the conferees I am disappointed that this item was deleted. I do express a hope that the Subcommittee of the House dealing with appropriations for Hill-Burton funds for 1971 will include the \$8,703,078 for the 35 hospitals which have started construction under the modernization program but have not received their full funding.

If for some unfortunate reason the funds these hospitals have full reason to believe would be received under the Hill-Burton Act are not included in the 1971 appropriation bill I will seek to have the funds included by amendment and trust the House in its wisdom will recognize its responsibility to fulfill its moral, and what I believe legal, commitment to these hospitals.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.
The conference report was agreed to.
A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENTS IN DISAGREEMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment numbered 2: Page 2, line 13, insert:

"FOOD AND NUTRITION SERVICE

"FOOD STAMP PROGRAM

"For necessary expenses of the Food Stamp Program pursuant to the Food Stamp Act of 1964, as amended, for the period July 1, 1970, to September 30, 1970, \$300,000,000, to be charged to the amount appropriated under this head in H.R. 17923, when enacted."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the date of September 30 named in said amendment insert "October 31".

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment numbered 10: Page 4, line 18, insert "Provided, That \$374,500 shall be available for construction services by the Director of General Services or by contract for architectural engineering services, as may be determined by the Commissioner."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "\$318,000".

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment numbered 12: Page 6, line 8, insert:

"GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

"REAL PROPERTY ACTIVITIES

"SITES AND EXPENSES, PUBLIC BUILDINGS PROJECTS

"For an additional amount for 'Sites and expenses, public buildings projects', \$371,000, to remain available until expended."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12 and concur therein

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment numbered 13: Page 6, line 14, insert:

"NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

"SALARIES AND EXPENSES

"For expenses necessary to carry out the purposes of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1861-1875), \$8,800,000, to remain available until expended."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House insist on its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13.

PREFERENTIAL MOTION OFFERED BY MR.

MILLER OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MILLER of California moves to recede from the disagreement to Senate amendment No. 13 and concur therein.

SENATE ADDITION FOR NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, a floor amendment adopted in the other body provided an additional \$8.8 million for the National Science Foundation for fiscal year 1970.

The Congress last year enacted legislation denying the Department of Defense funds to support basic research on any item other than that directly germane to defense programs.

It is now contended that about \$8.8 million in federally supported research in the universities was eliminated as a result of the operation of this legislation, and the purpose of amendment No. 13 is to restore such research support, but do so through the National Science Foundation. That is what amendment No. 13 is designed to do.

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

(Mr. EVINS of Tennessee asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I would say to my distinguished friend, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, that I shall not disagree with his position and that of the distinguished gentleman from California, but I certainly think this item needs some explanation.

Our Subcommittee on Independent Offices, which recommends funds for the programs of the National Science Foundation, proposed \$495 million for next year in the bill that passed the House on May 12. This is a \$57 million increase over the \$538 million appropriation of the previous year. The bill reported by the committee in the other body yesterday proposes \$511 million for next year, or an increase of about \$73 million over 1970.

I might say that the so-called Mansfield amendment adopted in the other body on the Military Procurement Authorization Act last year provided, in substance, that the Defense Department shall not engage in support of scientific research projects not relating to defense. We suspected that there would be a transfer of a lot of nonrelated projects

over to the National Science Foundation. However, the testimony of Dr. John Foster of the Department of Defense research program states that none have been transferred as of now. Therefore, I do not see the need for an emergency appropriation in this supplemental bill at this time, particularly at the close of the fiscal year and when the new fiscal year begins next Wednesday.

So, Mr. Speaker, this is not an emergency item for scientific research, and especially so when the National Science Foundation is generously funded for the new year.

But in view of the position taken by others, I shall not insist upon a vote on the matter. However, I think the National Science Foundation is more than generously funded at this time, and certainly does not need the additional sum for this fiscal year that will expire before this bill is enacted.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I have no very strong feelings about this matter. It is true that certain basic research efforts formerly financed by the Department of Defense can no longer be financed by that Department. I am advised that about \$8.8 million is involved. I am advised that this matter is covered in a report of inquiry prepared by the General Accounting Office, submitted to the Senate a couple of days ago. I have not had opportunity to study it. I would be glad to yield to the distinguished chairman of the committee which handles the authorizing legislation for the National Science Foundation for whatever statement he wishes to make.

Mr. MILLER of California. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. MILLER of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, this is a very touchy subject. This law reads that the Department of Defense cannot do certain research that it has heretofore done. The only place they can really turn to is the National Science Foundation. Some of this research may not be directly in line with defense activities, but it is so closely related to them that we must have an outlet or some place where this research can be done. What we are trying to do is to protect not only the whole field or science but to make it possible in an emergency for the National Science Foundation to fulfill its obligation and to pick up the cost of this matter of research.

Mr. MAHON. I again say, Mr. Speaker, that I do not have any very strong feelings on the matter. Clearly various colleges throughout the country are interested in this activity.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

(Mr. JONAS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JONAS. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I concur in the view expressed by the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. EVINS). We think

this supplemental item of \$8.8 million should be considered in the regular bill.

We have already provided in the House \$495 million for the National Science Foundation. That bill has not been acted on by the other body. I am surprised that a fight should be made to add \$8.8 million in a supplemental bill, especially when the fiscal year will end on next Tuesday night. We think this item should be considered under normal, ordinary procedure and should have gone over for consideration in the fiscal year 1971 bill that is now pending on the other side of the Capitol.

But if the gentleman from Tennessee is not disposed to insist on the position the House conferees took, I will concur in his decision.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, it would be unconscionable to put \$8.8 million into a supplemental appropriation bill for this purpose with the year expiring when? Next Tuesday or Wednesday?

Mr. MAHON. Next Tuesday night.

Mr. GROSS. That just does not make a nickel's worth of sense. I am astounded that the move has been made here today to put this money in under the circumstances that exist, especially in view of the fact that Congress has already approved \$495 million for the National Science Foundation. I urge that the House waste no further time in defeating the motion now pending.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the preferential motion.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the preferential motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER) to recede from disagreement to the Senate amendment No. 13 and concur therein.

The preferential motion was rejected.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas that the House insist on its disagreement to the Senate amendment No. 13.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment numbered 15: On page 7, strike out:

"COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

"SALARIES AND EXPENSES

"For expenses necessary for the Council on Environmental Quality in carrying out its functions under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (Public Law 91-190), including hire of passenger motor vehicles and partial support of the cabinet committee on environmental quality, and the Citizens' Advisory Committee on Environmental Quality, established by Executive Order 11472 of May 29, 1969, or any amendatory order, \$100,000."

And insert:

"COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY AND OFFICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

"SALARIES AND EXPENSES

"For expenses necessary for the Council on Environmental Quality and the Office of Environmental Quality, in carrying out their

functions under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (Public Law 91-190) and the Environmental Quality Improvement Act of 1970 (Public Law 91-224), including hire of passenger vehicles, and partial support of the Cabinet Committee on the Environment and the Citizen's Advisory Committee on Environmental Quality, established by Executive Order 11472 of May 29, 1969, as amended by Executive Order 11514 of March 5, 1970, \$400,000."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "\$350,000".

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 16: Page 9, line 4, insert:

"URBAN RENEWAL PROGRAMS

"For grants for urban renewal, fiscal year 1970, as an additional amount for urban renewal programs, as authorized by title I of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1450 et seq.) and section 314 of the Housing Act of 1954, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1452a), \$587,500,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That no part of any appropriation in this Act shall be used for administrative expenses in connection with commitments for grants aggregating more than the total of amounts available in the current year from the amounts authorized for making such commitments through June 30, 1967, plus the additional amounts appropriated therefor."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that that House insist on its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16.

PREFERENTIAL MOTION OFFERED BY MR. COHELAN

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. COHELAN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 16, and concur therein.

SENATE ADDITION OF \$587.5 MILLION UNBUDGETED FOR URBAN RENEWAL PROGRAMS

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, we are now confronted with a matter involving \$587.5 million for urban renewal programs.

The House and the other body continue to support urban renewal programs. On May 12, the House, in the appropriation bill managed on the floor by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. EVINS) and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONAS) approved the full budget estimate of \$1,000,000,000 for urban renewal for the fiscal year 1971 which begins next Wednesday.

Congress also provided \$1 billion for this program for the current fiscal year 1970.

In my judgment, there cannot be any possible defense for concurring in the Senate amendment now before us. I

would like to read that amendment. It states, on page 9, amendment No. 16:

For grants for urban renewal, fiscal year 1970—

Well, the fiscal year 1970 ends next Tuesday. It provides funds for the fiscal year which ends next Tuesday:

as an additional amount for urban renewal programs, as authorized. . . \$587,500,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, that no part of any appropriation in this Act shall be used for administrative expenses . . .

And so forth.

So, in the very dying hours of the current fiscal year, this is simply to provide—for this current fiscal year—an additional sum of \$587.5 million for urban renewal, on top of the \$1 billion already provided for the current fiscal year.

It is above the budget.

There were no committee hearings in either the House or Senate on the matter in connection with this bill.

If additional funds are desired, this is not the bill in which to add a \$587.5 million unbudgeted supplement that cannot be obligated in the current fiscal year which ends next Tuesday night. Any additional funds at this time could not be obligated until fiscal 1971.

As I said, the House-passed fiscal year 1971 appropriation bill contains \$1 billion.

The Committee on Appropriations of the other body has reported a bill adding \$300 million above the budget—and above the \$1 billion—for the fiscal year 1971 which begins next Wednesday.

The 1971 bill is the appropriate and orderly place and time to decide the funding level for urban renewal—not at the last minute in a supplemental bill that will expire before the funds can be obligated.

Of course, the other body will have its opportunity to do what it wishes with respect to the fiscal year 1971 program. The House provided \$1 billion. The other body will provide whatever sum it desires to provide. Then we will go to conference with the Senate to determine what the final figure will be for the fiscal year 1971 which begins next Wednesday.

It would be utterly indefensible and utterly inexcusable for us to provide for the fiscal year which ends next Tuesday an additional half billion dollars plus for urban renewal.

So, I stoutly support the motion I have offered to insist on our disagreement to the Senate addition of \$587.5 million. And I urge the House to vote down the preferential motion offered by the gentleman from California.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. COHELAN) to speak on his motion.

(Mr. COHELAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I regret that because of last minute developments it remains for me to call to the attention of the House the serious needs for this urban renewal money.

I did not realize what had happened in the conference until this morning. It

is only because of the fact that I am familiar with some of our procedures that I agreed to introduce the motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendments.

Now how did I get into this act?

This morning I got a call from many of the mayors in California. They told me about what they thought was their victory in the Senate. They said they had been frustrated by the action of the conference. They were in Washington and testified before the gentleman's committee. The committee was told of the tremendous problems facing our cities, of the huge backlog and the enormous need.

On the basis of the call this morning, I tried to find out more about it and, of course, I became more convinced that it was necessary to discuss this problem in the House this afternoon and try to restore the funds.

Today, however, urban renewal faces a financial crisis which could jeopardize its orderly continuation. There is currently a \$3 billion backlog of urban renewal applications at the Department of Housing and Urban Development; all funds for fiscal year 1970 have been exhausted. Unless additional funds are appropriated, hundreds of communities across the Nation will be forced to postpone, or worse, cancel urgently needed renewal projects.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday the Senate recognizing the pressing need for prompt action to avert this crisis, approved by an unprecedented vote of 70 to 12, an amendment to the supplemental appropriation bill (H.R. 17399) adding \$587.5 million for urban renewal. This is the additional authorized amount not appropriated for fiscal 1970.

The decision to concur with the Senate's action or to eliminate the full \$587.5 million appropriation for urban renewal is now before this body. It is, in my mind, imperative for us to agree to this figure. Nearly every Member of the House has pending urban renewal projects in his district. Without the additional money, the chance that these projects will be funded in the next year will significantly decrease.

To indicate the extent of this crisis, let me cite briefly four comments from some city officials on their desperate need for additional urban renewal money:

Stamford, Connecticut—Local efforts cannot be sustained on a continuing basis with the paralyzing effects of periodic interruptions in the availability of federal dollars.

Nanticoke, Pennsylvania—If we don't get our funds we'll have to close up shop.

National City, California—The citizens, property owners, Chamber of Commerce, City Council, and everyone connected with the project are sorely disappointed because many acute physical and environmental deficiencies in the neighborhood will not be corrected as a result of the cut in funds.

Hot Springs, Arkansas—It's a dangerous situation when you start a program and then stop it. The community is interested and enthusiastic about our programs. The job ultimately will have to be done. By postponing it, we will only have to do more—at greater cost—when we eventually tackle the problem.

Mr. Speaker, the accomplishments of urban renewal are well known to most of us. We have seen the construction of new moderately priced housing in what

was once a dilapidated and deteriorated neighborhood. We have witnessed the construction of new industrial parks within our cities which have generated new jobs and additional city revenues. We have watched as code enforcement or rehabilitation programs helped to maintain good neighborhoods which would have been transformed into slums if left unaided.

Nationally, the statistics are impressive. Over 1,000 communities are now participating in the program in every State. It is a program which assists communities of all sizes; in fact, over one half of the participating communities have a population of less than 25,000.

In housing, over a quarter of a million new or rehabilitated housing units have already been started or completed, 53 percent of which are low and moderate income housing. In addition, when all redevelopment in programs approved through fiscal year 1969 are completed, nearly 1.3 million housing units, 66 percent low and moderate income, will have been generated.

In employment and commerce, over 5,000 commercial, industrial and institutional structures have been completed or are under construction as a result of renewal. This has already generated about half a million permanent jobs. When present planned redevelopment is completed, an additional 2.2 million jobs will result.

The assessed tax valuation of land and improvements has increased an average of 240 percent in completed renewal projects, thus expanding the local tax base.

In the investment of other funds, one Federal renewal dollar will generate \$5.30 of local private and public money.

While these statistics are impressive, there is another set which are depressing if Congress does not appropriate additional renewal funds. The National League of Cities and U.S. Conference of Mayors have compiled a list of pending and proposed urban renewal applications using data from the Department of Housing and Urban Development and the National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials. Current needs for the 50 States exceed 3¼ billion. There are currently a total of 1,325 applications from cities in 49 States. Mr. Speaker, at this time I wish to submit this document for in section in the RECORD.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, the need is obvious. The fiscal 1971 appropriation, which will be between \$1 billion and \$1.7 billion will be inadequate to meet this \$3.75 billion demand. The additional appropriation of \$587.5 million is an absolute necessity.

I urge the acceptance of the Senate addition of urban renewal funds.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COHELAN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania who is very knowledgeable in this field.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I certainly want to say to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations that while the fiscal year is ending, and he thinks it would not be helpful to put this \$587.5

million in the bill at this time. Unless this money is included in this appropriation's bill it will cut off any of the urban renewal money today.

I hope this House this afternoon will sustain the preferential motion made by the gentleman from California.

So Mr. Speaker, I urge the House to adopt the preferential motion to add funds for urban renewal in the supplemental appropriations bill. The Senate added to the supplemental appropriations bill an amendment which provided an additional \$587.5 million for urban renewal. This addition of funds for urban renewal will bring the total urban renewal funds up to what Congress authorized for fiscal year 1970. The Congress has authorized, but not appropriated a total of \$2.287 billion, which includes \$400 million authorized for the current fiscal year in addition to the \$1 billion already appropriated; \$187 million authorized for renewal in model cities areas, and \$1.7 billion authorized for fiscal year 1971. The administration has asked the Congress for a \$1 billion appropriations for fiscal year 1971, which falls short by \$1.287 billion of what Congress itself has said it needed.

The Department of Housing and Urban Development has estimated that as of March 31, 1970, actual applications pending from some 500 cities totals almost \$2.1 billion. This figure does not include projects now being developed locally and not yet submitted for funding.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that most of the Members here today have been contacted by their mayors, who have pleaded with us for more renewal funds. Many of our cities are having their urban renewal programs severely restricted because of the administration cutback in renewal funding. I know that the distinguished Speaker's home city of Boston has had its urban renewal program almost brought to a halt. The same situation exists in my own city of Philadelphia where the urban renewal program again has been brought to a halt. Mr. Speaker, as Chairman of the Housing Subcommittee and as one who has been vitally concerned with the operation of the urban renewal program over the past 20 years.

Mr. COHELAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COHELAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SCHEUER. This measure is vital to the free enterprise community, which we all support.

The building industry in this country is in desperate straits. Mortgage money is virtually impossible to obtain at reasonable rates. So are construction funds. These funds will enable us to move ahead and put into housing production vacant cleared land—blocks and blocks in our cities which have become the favorite neighborhood dumping ground for garbage, abandoned cars, beds, chairs, refrigerators, bicycles and the like.

These cleared lots—fast becoming festering eyesores—are dramatic evidence of our lack of national will and purpose to rebuild our cities and provide low- and moderate-income housing for the poor,

and the middle-class people who do not want to be forced out of our cities to suburbia. Let us pass this measure and get on with the job.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I urge an "aye" vote.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WILLIAMS), 2 minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Texas for yielding to me. I do want to correct the gentleman from Pennsylvania who says that Mr. MAHON's motion involves \$50 million. Actually it involves a sum in excess of \$500 million.

I would also like to remind the Members of the House that the wealth of this country is concentrated in the urban areas, and I happen to reside in and represent one section of an urban area. If we are going to raise taxes to help urban areas, those taxes must in good part come from the urban areas in which the wealth of this country is located. I know that the cities have not been doing as much to help themselves as they can. I would like to suggest to my distinguished colleague from California that perhaps the cities have been taught to expect to get something for nothing, and that could be the root of our trouble.

I certainly hope that Mr. MAHON's motion will be sustained.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RYAN).

(Mr. RYAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the preferential motion by the gentleman from California to recede and concur in Senate amendment No. 16. This supplemental appropriation of \$587.5 million is essential to fully fund the urban renewal program. The urban renewal program and other housing programs have been underfunded for too long. This gives us an opportunity to match the authorization with appropriations in this fiscal year. The crisis in our cities is so extreme, urban blight is having such a devastating impact not only in terms of deteriorating housing, but in terms of the intolerable conditions under which people are living, that all manner of disastrous consequences result.

I urge that we support this motion. There is a \$3-billion backlog now pending in urban renewal applications. Let us get on with the task of solving the crisis which concerns us in the major cities. New York City and every other major city can use all the funds which Congress can appropriate.

It has been said that no committee hearings were held in connection with this appropriation. I would like to remind the Chairman, however, that on April 8, I appeared before the Subcommittee on Independent Offices and Department of Housing and Urban Renewal of the Appropriations Committees. My testimony may be found at pages 521-26 of the hearings. And more specifically, my comments in regard to a supplemental appropriation for the

urban renewal program may also be found at that location.

In the course of my testimony, and in calling for full funding of the urban renewal program—as provided in my bill H.R. 15643 (companion bills H.R. 15729 and H.R. 15844), I stated the urgent need for additional funds for urban renewal:

Urban Renewal is at the very core of the governmental effort to clear our Nation's slums and halt urban blight. Decay of our cities is not going to stand still awaiting adequate Federal funds to combat it; it continues, it persists, and it grows in severity.

Obviously, even the \$587,500,000 which the other body has added to the second supplemental appropriation bill for fiscal year 1970 will not be able to fill the enormous \$3 billion backlog. But Senate amendment No. 16 is a significant step.

Let me briefly review this program, which provides Federal financial assistance to local communities to absorb part of the cost of local programs designed for neighborhood redevelopment, rehabilitation, or conservation.

Since 1949, over 1,000 communities—in all 50 States—have participated or are participating in the urban renewal program. Over half of these communities have a population below 25,000; and over \$8.2 billion has been approved in Federal grants to assist the over 1,000 participants.

Under the urban renewal program over a quarter of a million new or rehabilitated housing units have already been started or completed, 53 percent of which are low- and moderate-income housing. When all redevelopment in programs approved through June 30, 1969, is completed, it will have generated nearly 1.3 million housing units, of which 66 percent are low and moderate income.

Urban renewal activity has generated about 500,000 permanent jobs. When present planned redevelopment is completed, over 2.2 million jobs will have been generated. Approximately \$5.30 of local private and public investment has been generated for each urban renewal dollar. The assessed tax valuation of land and improvements has increased an average of 240 percent in completed renewal projects, thereby expanding the local tax base.

Urban renewal is a sound investment in the future of America. The preferential motion should be adopted.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, there is a crisis in the cities and there is a crisis in the rural areas, but there is also a crisis in the fiscal affairs of our country as well as an inflationary crisis—and no one knows this inflationary crisis better than the people in the cities and urban areas.

We may well have a \$12 billion deficit for the forthcoming fiscal year when we omit account of the \$8 billion-plus that will be borrowed from the social security and highway and the other trust funds, so if we are going to try to look after the cities and the rural areas, we have to try to look after the fiscal stability of our country, because if money is not going to be stable and supportable, then

we will not be able to buy much with it.

I would hope that the gentleman from North Carolina would make some detailed reference to what we are doing for the cities. Believe me, we are doing much for the cities.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, as the distinguished gentleman from Texas has said, we all know there is a crisis in the urban areas, but one listening to the proponents of this preferential motion would think we are not doing much about it. The contrary is the case. We are doing a great deal to assist the cities in solving their problems. The citation of a few facts and figures should make this clear to all fairminded people.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONAS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, in 1970, we will have approximately 1,200 applications pending for urban renewal projects, asking for funds.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, let me say to my friend from Pennsylvania that the Urban Renewal Administration—and I would like the members of the committee to hear these facts, because they are accurate and are taken from the record—has on hand now \$2 billion of undisbursed urban renewal appropriations. That money has to be raised. It is not in the bank. We have to go out into the money market to raise it. But the pertinent point is that HUD has \$2 billion in previously appropriated but undisbursed urban renewal funds.

What else has been done for urban renewal?

We have reported out of our committee, and this House passed last April, a bill providing \$1 billion for urban renewal—and that is another billion dollars to add to the \$2 billion on hand and unspent. We gave them \$1 billion last year, and we are giving them another billion for fiscal year 1971 in a bill that already passed the House and pending in the other body. The Senate committee has increased that to \$1.3 billion.

As the gentleman from Texas has said, here we are in the closing days of a fiscal year which will end next Tuesday night, and suddenly the other body comes up with \$587 million of additional funds above the \$1 billion already provided. We have to superimpose that on top of the \$1 billion in the 1971 bill already cleared by the House. This is only for urban renewal—\$2 billion in undisbursed funds, \$1 billion provided in the 1970 regular bill and another \$1 billion in the House passed bill for 1971, and yet they are asking the taxpayers to put up another \$587 million in the supplemental for a fiscal year that will end in 4 days.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a moment?

Mr. JONAS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, is it not true that under the wording of the continuing resolution for fiscal 1971 which cleared the Congress yesterday, that re-

ardless of this bill, this additional \$1 billion will become available next Wednesday morning?

Mr. JONAS. That is correct. That was provided in the continuing resolution which cleared the House yesterday.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONAS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. COHELAN. I should like to keep the record clear, because we can all learn something. Either the gentleman is correct and we have a plethora of funds or something is wrong, because these fellows calling me from California are saying there is a \$3 billion backlog. They argued this over in the Senate. The Senate vote indicates they must consider the argument overwhelming. There is an enormous and critical unmet need, as I understand it.

If the gentleman could persuade me—I have high regard for the gentleman, as he well knows—I would be the first to go along and explain it to these people. It seems to me they must know that there is something wrong.

Mr. JONAS. If the gentleman will bear with me, I hope to be able to give him some facts he can use in discussing this issue with the mayors. If they know the facts I believe they will quit complaining about Congress being niggardly with funds for the cities.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONAS. I yield to my colleague on the committee from Pennsylvania.

Mr. McDADE. On the point which the gentleman from North Carolina is making, it is interesting to note that in the figures we have been supplied in the committee, actual expenditures for urban renewal alone in fiscal year 1969 were \$2.9 billion, and by fiscal year 1971 HUD estimates actual spending on urban renewal is going to be in excess of \$5 billion, almost double. So, there is an increasing level of effort. In light of this fact, it seems most inappropriate to add this large sum without even a moment of hearings, and just before the close of the fiscal year.

Mr. JONAS. That is right. Yet, it continues to be said we are not providing much money for urban renewal and other programs for the cities. I do not understand what it will take to satisfy the critics.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOLIFIELD). The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from North Carolina yield?

Mr. JONAS. Will my friend from New York allow me to use about 4 of my 5 additional minutes, and then I shall be glad to yield.

The gentleman from California is talking about applications. I am talking about funds that have to be raised by the Treasury to take care of the contracts that are let.

The gentleman may be correct. There are, indeed, many applications on file for additional projects. But I am talking

about a spending level, which used to be about \$750 million a year. Now we have it up to \$1 billion, and that does not satisfy them.

I say to the gentleman that the testimony before the committee indicates they have \$2 billion in unexpended funds that have previously been appropriated for urban renewal, funds that they do not have in the bank. They will have to go out into this tight money market to raise those funds to go ahead with the contracts.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I understand that. Is it not true that that money is already committed? I understand that. It is obligated money.

Mr. JONAS. It is obligated on the books, but it has not been spent. It has not been raised and it is not in the Treasury.

Mr. COHELAN. That is earmarked money. I understand that. It is in escrow, as it were.

Mr. JONAS. The difference between the gentleman from California and the gentleman from North Carolina is that the gentleman from California thinks it does not make any difference how many applications are filed, we have to put up the money to fund them all at one time. I do not believe we can afford to do it.

Mr. COHELAN. I say to the gentleman from North Carolina with the greatest of respect, we have to in this country respond to what is a critical need.

Mr. JONAS. Now may I go ahead and put on the record some other figures which I believe ought to be considered before we vote on this.

We hear a lot of complaints that we are neglecting the cities. I have just discussed the tremendous effort being made for urban renewal—involving a billion dollars a year and \$2 billion in unspent funds. That is only one program for the cities.

What about the \$575 million put up for model cities in the bill we passed last April?

What about the \$291 million we have already appropriated this year for metropolitan development?

What about the \$654 million we put up this year to pay the 1 year subsidy on the 900,000 public housing units that we are contracted to continue to subsidize for 40 years, the total cost of which could go to \$35 billion?

What about the \$170 million authorized in new contract authority for additional public housing units? The cost of that item alone for 40 years will be \$6.8 billion.

What about the additional \$50 million in rent supplement contract authority that we have already voted this year? When I mentioned that please understand you have to multiply by 40 because that is a contract obligating the taxpayers to pay \$50 million a year for 40 years. This program could cost the taxpayers \$6.8 billion if we stop it right now and do not make a new contract.

What about the \$130 million of new contract authority we have granted this year for home ownership assistance? If you multiply that by 30 years, you have an obligation there of \$3.9 billion. That

program alone, if it ends this year, without another new contract, could cost the taxpayers \$10 billion.

What about the \$135 million of new contract authority we have granted this year for the rental assistance program? That is for low-income people. All of these programs are for urban citizens who are seeking housing. But urban renewal, where you are trying to add \$575 million, will not build a single house. You tear down houses with urban renewal; you do not construct houses.

I am saying to you that you cannot make a case, if you look at the record, against Congress for being parsimonious in its dealings with the cities.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. JONAS. As a matter of fact—my distinguished friend from Tennessee will agree with this—these four programs I have enumerated here involve an obligation on the part of the American taxpayers of about \$65 billion. Yet people stand on the floor and say we are not doing anything for the cities. Here are a half dozen programs we are appropriating money and granting new contract authority for, and I do not think we deserve the criticism that the Congress is receiving from the mayors and from some of our colleagues who charge that we are doing nothing for the cities.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONAS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BARRETT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I just want to point out this: I know the gentleman is very economical and has a very good approach to economy, but I think the gentleman knows better than anyone else in this House, in spite of all the concessions and statements relative to what you have done for the cities, I think you will agree, if you do not put money into the urban areas, the deterioration will become greater and the cost of rescuing our cities will become astronomical.

Mr. JONAS. Does my friend think that \$1 billion is an insignificant sum for one program for 1 year—when you superimpose that on all of these other programs? What I am objecting to is the fact that so many people say we are doing nothing for the cities when the record shows we will spend about \$44 billion for social and welfare programs, mostly for urban dwellers, during this current year.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONAS. I promised to yield first to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. COLLIER).

Mr. COLLIER. I just want to reiterate what the gentleman just said in evaluating the assistance to the cities. We cannot afford to overlook the amount of money put into the urban mass transit system and, in fact, even the impacted aid goes primarily to the schools in the urban areas.

But, I would like to clarify this point: My friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BARRETT), said there were

500,000 applications pending. If they were all meritorious and if there was not the necessity for screening these and if each of these were approved in the sum of \$20,000, we would need \$10 billion just to take care of those applications. That, of course, is absolutely unrealistic.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOLIFIELD). The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has again expired.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONAS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Let me commend my friend from North Carolina for his opposition to this motion. It is my understanding that HUD does not want this added money at this time; is that correct?

Mr. JONAS. This money is not even budgeted. No one in the administration has asked for it. No request has been submitted for it by HUD.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, is there any money in this supplemental appropriation bill with which to buy furniture for welfare mothers to use to break out windows and the glass doors of public buildings as they did here in Washington a couple of days ago?

Mr. JONAS. No.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman now yield?

Mr. JONAS. I now yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. RYAN. The fact remains that the \$2 billion about which the gentleman spoke is already committed. It is money in the pipeline. There is now a \$3 billion backlog in pending applications. What this \$587.5 million does is to close the gap between the money which has already been authorized by the Congress and the money appropriated. Amendment No. 16 will provide full funding. That is the point.

Mr. JONAS. In the final seconds remaining to me, I wish to join my distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON), in the remarks he made. If this preferential motion should not be voted down on its merits—and I think it should be because I think the committee and Congress has been very generous in providing funds for these programs but, if it should not be voted down on its merits, it ought to be voted down as a procedural matter because this is not the place, this is not the time to put a \$587 million unbudgeted item in a supplemental appropriation bill for fiscal year 1970 which will end next Tuesday.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina has just made a very wise statement, that it would seem preposterous to put over a half billion dollars in this bill at this time for the fiscal year which ends next Tuesday.

I inquired of the Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, Mr. Romney, about the position of the Department in regard to this matter. I was told that Secretary Romney was out of the city. However, it is

pretty well known, I think, that Secretary Romney is rather sympathetic to spending Federal dollars for urban problems, and Congress has given him a lot of support in those programs. I was told by the representative of the Secretary that he hoped that it would be possible to maintain the House position and oppose the half billion dollars Senate addition.

The chairman of the Subcommittee on Independent Offices Appropriations, who has worked for years with this program and who is responsible for guiding appropriations for tens of millions of dollars through the Congress, should be heard and I now yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. EVINS).

(Mr. EVINS of Tennessee asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the preferential motion of the gentleman from California (Mr. COHELAN) and to support the position of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MAHON).

The gentleman from California referred to coming before our committee. He did come before our committee and he and the mayors appeared in support of funds for the next fiscal year which begins July 1. We know he and the mayors are very much interested in urban renewal programs.

The gentleman can advise his mayors that there will be \$1 billion in new funds for 1971 for urban renewal programs, which will arrive on Wednesday of next week. What we are talking about now is a supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year that is just ending.

A total of \$1 billion has already been provided for urban renewal programs in the current year. This is the full budget request.

I want to say further that we have provided substantial sums for the urban renewal program for many years, along with funds for many other programs for the cities. Urban renewal only a short time ago was funded on the basis of about \$750 million annually. The House has already approved \$1 billion for 1971, and that is the full amount requested by the Department. A total of \$10,037,500,000 has presently been made available for urban renewal programs through the current fiscal year.

The \$587,500,000, we are talking about now should not be in this bill. The other body did not have hearings on it in connection with this bill. It was added by an amendment on the floor of the other body. I hope we all understand the matter, and that we have been funding this program for many years.

Last year \$1 billion was provided. Next year it will be at least \$1 billion because the Senate committee has added \$300 million to the amount which passed the House.

Now, regarding money that is going into the cities, we have the budget statement which indicates that about \$44 billion of Federal financial commitments are being provided to the cities annually. This is no small amount, as we pointed out in our report on the 1971 bill, we want the House to understand about the

aid that is presently going into the cities. This is more substantial when considered in total than many realize.

The \$3 billion in appropriations that are provided in the regular bill for HUD programs in 1971 is only the tip of the iceberg. This includes \$1 billion for urban renewal, \$655 million for public housing, \$575 million for model cities, and funds for many other programs. Homeownership, rental housing assistance, rent supplements, and other programs provide billions in long-term obligations for payments over the next 20, 30, or 40 years. These programs will continue to provide increasingly greater assistance to the people in urban centers. As I have mentioned, there is presently an estimated \$44 billion in Federal support going into the cities each year.

Of course, you cannot satisfy all of the demands of some of the mayors. There is not enough revenue to do so. They want to get as much money as possible from Washington, and will continue to send telegrams. All of us have received telegrams.

The gentleman from California should explain to his mayors that he testified in support of funds for next year, which begins July 1. There is \$1 billion in the House bill. There is \$1.3 billion in the Senate bill.

I repeat, there were no hearings on this item. There is no budget estimate. It was added on the floor of the Senate, and it should be denied. The preferential motion of the gentleman from California should be voted down.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I strongly agree with the gentleman from Tennessee that the preferential motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. COHELAN) should be voted down.

The Committee on Appropriations has tried to do a good job helping the House find the right road to follow in fiscal matters, and we have been as generous as we could be under all the circumstances in these various programs. The budget is in the red, even after borrowing about \$8.5 billion from the trust funds.

The pending \$587 million is, as has been said repeatedly, for the fiscal year 1970 which ends next Tuesday.

It could not be used in this fiscal year 1970.

It is above the budget.

The new fiscal year begins next Wednesday. It would seem to me that the House would not at the end of the fiscal year, while talking about economy, and being very much concerned about inflation—it would seem unbelievable that the House would want—for the fiscal year 1970—to go nearly \$600 million above the President's budget on this program. It just cannot be defended in the circumstances.

I hope that the preferential motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. COHELAN) will be voted down, and that when the vote comes the Members of the House will vote "No," and that the House managers will be sustained in their position to insist upon denying the \$587.5 million added by the other body.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the preferential motion.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the preferential motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. COHELAN) that the House recede from its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 16 and concur therein.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 136, nays 236, not voting 57, as follows:

[Roll No. 189]

YEAS—136

Adams	Gallagher	Nedzi
Addabbo	Garmatz	Nix
Albert	Gibbons	O'Hara
Anderson, Calif.	Gray	O'Konski
Annunzio	Green, Oreg.	Olsen
Ashley	Green, Pa.	O'Neill, Mass.
Aspinall	Griffiths	Ottinger
Barrett	Gude	Pepper
Biaggi	Halpern	Perkins
Bingham	Hanley	Philbin
Boggs	Hansen, Wash.	Podell
Boland	Harrington	Price, Ill.
Bolling	Hays	Rees
Brasco	Hébert	Reid, N.Y.
Brown, Calif.	Hechler, W. Va.	Reuss
Burke, Mass.	Heckler, Mass.	Rodino
Burton, Calif.	Helstoski	Roe
Button	Holifield	Rogers, Colo.
Byrne, Pa.	Horton	Rooney, N.Y.
Celler	Howard	Rooney, Pa.
Chisholm	Jacobs	Rostenkowski
Clark	Johnson, Calif.	Roybal
Clay	Kartha	Ryan
Cohelan	Kastenmeier	St Germain
Conyers	Kluczynski	Scheuer
Corman	Koch	Sisk
Coughlin	Kyros	Staggers
Cowger	Leggett	Stokes
Culver	Lowenstein	Stratton
Diggs	McCarthy	Sullivan
Dingell	McFall	Symington
Donohue	Macdonald, Mass.	Thompson, N.J.
Dulski	Madden	Tunney
Dwyer	Matsunaga	Udall
Eckhardt	Meeds	Ullman
Edwards, Calif.	Mikva	Van Deerlin
Eilberg	Miller, Calif.	Vanik
Fallon	Minish	Vigorito
Fascell	Mink	Waldie
Feighan	Monagan	Weicker
Ford	Moorhead	Whalen
William D. Fraser	Morgan	Wolff
Friedel	Morse	Yates
Fulton, Pa.	Moss	Yatron
Fulton, Tenn.	Murphy, Ill.	Zablocki
	Murphy, N.Y.	

NAYS—236

Abbott	Brown, Mich.	Colmer
Abernethy	Brown, Ohio	Conable
Anderson, Ill.	Broyhill, N.C.	Conte
Andrews, Ala.	Broyhill, Va.	Corbett
Andrews, N. Dak.	Buchanan	Crane
Arends	Burke, Fla.	Cunningham
Ashbrook	Burleson, Tex.	Daniel, Va.
Beall, Md.	Burlison, Mo.	Davis, Ga.
Belcher	Burton, Utah	Davis, Wis.
Bell, Calif.	Byrnes, Wis.	Delaney
Bennett	Cabell	Dellenback
Berry	Camp	Denney
Betts	Carter	Dennis
Bevill	Casey	Derwinski
Biester	Cederberg	Devine
Blackburn	Chamberlain	Dickinson
Blanton	Chappell	Dorn
Bray	Clausen	Dowdy
Brinkley	Don H.	Downing
Brooks	Clawson, Del.	Duncan
Broomfield	Cleveland	Edmondson
Brotzman	Collier	Edwards, Ala.
	Collins	Edwards, La.

Eshleman	Lujan	Roudebush
Evans, Colo.	Lukens	Ruppe
Evins, Tenn.	McClory	Ruth
Findley	McCloskey	Sandman
Fish	McClure	Satterfield
Fisher	McCulloch	Saylor
Flood	McDade	Schadeberg
Flynt	McDonald, Mich.	Scherle
Foley	McEwen	Schneebeli
Ford, Gerald R.	McKneally	Schwengel
Foreman	MacGregor	Scott
Fountain	Mahon	Sebelius
Frelinghuysen	Mailliard	Shipley
Fuqua	Marsh	Shriver
Galifianakis	Martin	Sikes
Gettys	Mathias	Skubitz
Goldwater	May	Slack
Gonzalez	Mayne	Smith, Calif.
Goodling	Melcher	Smith, N.Y.
Griffin	Michel	Snyder
Gross	Miller, Ohio	Springer
Grover	Mills	Stafford
Gubser	Minshall	Stanton
Hagan	Mize	Steed
Haley	Mizell	Steiger, Ariz.
Hammer-schmidt	Morton	Steiger, Wis.
Hanna	Mosher	Stephens
Harsha	Myers	Stubblefield
Harvey	Natcher	Stuckey
Henderson	Nelsen	Taft
Hicks	Nichols	Talcott
Hogan	Obey	Taylor
Hosmer	O'Neal, Ga.	Teague, Calif.
Hull	Patman	Thompson, Ga.
Hungate	Pelly	Thomson, Wis.
Hunt	Pettis	Vander Jagt
Hutchinson	Pickle	Waggonner
Ichord	Pike	Wampler
Johnson, Pa.	Pirnie	Watts
Jonas	Poage	Whalley
Jones, Ala.	Poff	White
Jones, N.C.	Pollock	Whitehurst
Jones, Tenn.	Preyer, N.C.	Whitten
Kazen	Pryor, Ark.	Widnall
Kee	Pucinski	Wiggins
King	Purcell	Williams
Kleppe	Quie	Wilson, Bob
Kuykendall	Quillen	Winn
Kyl	Randall	Wold
Landgrebe	Rarick	Wright
Landrum	Reid, Ill.	Wyatt
Langen	Reifel	Wylder
Latta	Rhodes	Wylie
Lennon	Roberts	Wyman
Lloyd	Rogers, Fla.	Young
Long, La.	Roth	Zion
		Zwach

NOT VOTING—57

Adair	Erlenborn	Meskill
Alexander	Esch	Mollohan
Anderson, Tenn.	Farbstein	Montgomery
Ayres	Flowers	Passman
Baring	Frey	Patten
Blatnik	Gaydos	Powell
Bow	Gialmo	Price, Tex.
Brademas	Gilbert	Railsback
Brock	Hall	Riegle
Bush	Hamilton	Rivers
Caffery	Hansen, Idaho	Robison
Carey	Hastings	Rosenthal
Clancy	Hathaway	Smith, Iowa
Cramer	Hawkins	Teague, Tex.
Daddario	Jarman	Tiernan
Daniels, N.J.	Keith	Watkins
Dawson	Kirwan	Watson
de la Garza	Long, Md.	Wilson
Dent	McMillan	Charles H.
	Mann	

So the preferential motion was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Adair.
Mr. McMillan, with Mr. Bow.
Mr. Daniels of New Jersey with Mr. Ayers.
Mr. Dent with Mr. Watkins.
Mr. Mollohan with Mr. Robison.
Mr. Carey with Mr. Hastings.
Mr. Rivers with Mr. Hall.
Mr. Montgomery with Mr. Clancy.
Mr. de la Garza with Mr. Price of Texas.
Mr. Brademas with Mr. Railsback.
Mr. Anderson of Tennessee with Mr. Keith.
Mr. Alexander with Mr. Watson.
Mr. Daddario with Mr. Meskill.
Mr. Long of Maryland with Mr. Erlenborn.
Mr. Patten with Mr. Esch.
Mr. Flowers with Mr. Frey.
Mr. Hamilton with Mr. Hansen of Idaho.
Mr. Gialmo with Mr. Riegle.

Mr. Smith of Iowa with Mr. Cramer.
Mr. Passman with Mr. Bush.
Mr. Baring with Mr. Brock.
Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Mann.
Mr. Hawkins with Mr. Farbstein.
Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Powell.
Mr. Caffery with Mr. Gaydos.
Mr. Gilbert with Mr. Charles H. Wilson.
Mr. Hathaway with Mr. Jarman.
Mr. Tiernan with Mr. Rosenthal.

Mr. FALLON and Mr. O'KONSKI changed their votes from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas that the House insist on its disagreement to the Senate amendment No. 16.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 20: Page 12, line 11, insert "including \$172,000 to remain available until expended."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 22: Page 13, line 17, insert:

"TRADE ADJUSTMENT ACTIVITIES

"For an additional amount for 'Trade Adjustment Activities', \$2,330,000, together with such amount as may be necessary to be charged to the subsequent year appropriation for these expenses for any period subsequent to March 31 of the current year."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 24: Page 16, line 3, insert:

"SENATE

"CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE SENATE

"INQUIRIES AND INVESTIGATIONS

"For an additional amount for 'Inquiries and Investigations', fiscal year 1970, \$345,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation, 'Salaries, Officers and Employees', fiscal year 1970."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 50: Page 48, line 15, insert: "Provided, That \$200,000 of this appropriation shall be available only upon enactment into law of S. 2694, Ninety-first Congress, or similar legislation;"

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 50 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the bill number S. 2694 named in said amendment insert: "H.R. 17138".

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 51: Page 51, line 21, insert:

"APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION

"Salaries and expenses", \$42,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for 'Appalachian regional development programs';"

MOTION OFFERED BY MAHON

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 51 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 62: On page 63, line 20, insert:

"Sec. 604. Funds appropriated, or otherwise made available, by this Act for the fiscal year 1970, shall remain available for obligation until July 1, 1970, or for five days after the date of approval of this Act, whichever is later, unless a longer period is specifically provided: *Provided*, That all obligations incurred in anticipation of such appropriations and authority for the fiscal year 1970 as well as those for longer periods as set forth herein are hereby ratified and confirmed if in accordance with the terms hereof."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MAHON

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 62 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the conference report just agreed to and also amendment No. 13, pertaining to the National Science Foundation, and amendment No. 16, pertaining to urban renewal programs for fiscal year 1970.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRICE of Illinois). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

EMERGENCY HOME FINANCE ACT OF 1970

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1094 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 1094

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 17495) to increase the availability of mortgage credit for the financing of urgently needed housing, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule by titles instead of by sections. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit. After the passage of H.R. 17495, the Committee on Banking and Currency shall be discharged from the further consideration of the bill S. 3685, and it shall then be in order in the House to move to strike out all after the enacting clause of said Senate bill and insert in lieu thereof the provisions contained in H.R. 17495 as passed by the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BOLLING) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SMITH) pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I know of no particular controversy on the rule. Of course, the bill that it would make in order does have some controversy. The rule is an open rule providing for 2 hours of general debate. It provides that the bill be read by title. It also provides that at the conclusion of consideration of the bill under the 5-minute rule, at the conclusion of the proceedings, it would be possible to send the bill to conference.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. SMITH of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I concur in the statements made by the distinguished gentleman from Missouri in explanation of House Resolution 1094, the rule providing for consideration of H.R. 17495, the Emergency Home Finance Act of 1970.

The purpose of the bill is to increase the availability of mortgage credit for

the financing of the home building industry.

Interest rates today are at historic high levels. Even at such rates money is in extremely short supply. The effect has been to tie up home construction. Low- and middle-income families cannot afford to pay the interest rates and many others cannot find available money at a reasonable price.

The bill seeks to alleviate these problems by: First, reducing interest charges for members of the Federal Home Loan Bank System—the savings and loan associations; second, establishing secondary markets for conventional mortgages under the Federal National Mortgage Association and the Federal Home Loan Bank Systems; third, authorizing an additional funding for the Government National Mortgage Association special assistance activities concerning secondary mortgage purposes; and fourth, extending the authority for setting FHA and VA interest rates at levels high enough to insure continuation of mortgage money in these two programs; and fifth, permitting investment of commercial bank reserves in housing mortgages.

Mr. Speaker, additional views in this matter have been filed by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PATMAN) objecting to deletion of title V from the bill, the title creating a National Development Bank authorized to provide \$4 billion a year to guarantee funding to construct 200,000 housing units for lower- and middle-income families, no loan to carry interest rates in excess of 6½ percent. The bill as originally proposed provided for establishment of this National Development Bank, the main source of funds of which would be the annual compulsory assessment of up to 2.5 percent of assets of pension funds and private foundations.

The proposal is of doubtful constitutionality. The provision was opposed by the administration and deleted by the Committee on Banking and Currency. I support the committee action to delete section 505.

I think we should keep in mind, Mr. Speaker, if I understand the parliamentary situation, that the language of the committee in this bill is actually a committee amendment, so in order to make certain that title V is not retained in the bill, if that is the position we take—and that is the position I take—we will have to be certain to vote in support of the committee amendment, which deleted title V.

We may end up by getting two or three votes on this. We will get a vote in the Committee of the Whole House. We may get a vote in the House on it, and I am not certain who will handle the motion to recommit, but we could get a vote on it. To be certain, if we want to keep this proposal of the gentleman from Texas out of the bill, as the committee voted, we should vote to support the committee amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I support the adoption of the rule.

I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON), such time as he may consume.

(Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois asked and

DIGEST of Congressional Proceedings

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(FOR INFORMATION ONLY;
NOT TO BE QUOTED OR CITED)

For actions of June 29, 1970
91st-2nd; No. 108

CONTENTS

Almonds.....7	Lands.....15	Rivers and Harbors.....3
Apples.....7	Loans.....7	River Basins.....11
Appropriations.....1	Manganese Ore.....9	Second Supplemental.....1
Committee Action.....7	Marketing Orders.....7	Stockpile.....10
Conservation.....7	Marketing Research....7	Subcommittees Actions...8
Debt Limit.....2	Minerals.....10	Tariffs.....9
Electrification.....5	National Parks.....3	Veterans Benefits.....16
Environment.....6	Opinion Poll.....13	Wild Rivers.....6
Farm Program.....12	Prices.....14	
Joint Committee on Environment..4	Recreation.....3	

HIGHLIGHTS. Senate Committee reported FY 71 agricultural appropriations bill. Senate agreed to conference report on second supplemental appropriations bill. Senate passed bill increasing public debt limit. House Committee reported bills regarding marketing orders for apples, loans for land conservation and utilization, increasing certain loan limitations, and marketing research for almonds. House subcommittees approved bills allowing FS to contract for aerial facilities and permitting marketing agreements for Hawaiian papayas.

SENATE

1. APPROPRIATIONS. Committee on Appropriations reported with amendments H. R. 17923, agricultural appropriations bill FY 71 (S. Rept. No. 91-987). A copy of the report will be attached to the Digest as soon as available.
p. S10055

Agreed to conference report on H. R. 17399, second supplemental appropriations for FY 1970. This bill now goes to the President.
pp. S10090-10100

2. DEBT LIMIT. Passed without amendment H. R. 17802 increasing the public debt limit. This bill now goes to the President. pp. S10181-82, S10194-209
3. NATIONAL PARKS; RECREATION; RIVERS AND HARBORS. Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs reported with an amendment S. 532 to establish the Arches National Park in the State of Utah (S. Rept. No. 91-990); and with amendments S. 3547 to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct the Narrows Unit, Missouri River Basin Project, Colorado, (S. Rept. No. 91-991). p. S10055
4. JOINT COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT. Special Senate Joint Subcommittee in executive session agreed to recommend to their respective full committees the favorable reporting of S.J. Res. 207 to establish a nonlegislative Joint Committee on the Environment (but no report was actually submitted). p. D699
5. ELECTRIFICATION. Received report from Administrator, REA, reporting approval of a loan to East Kentucky REA Corp. of Winchester, Ky.; to Committee on Appropriations. p. S10054
6. WILD RIVERS; ENVIRONMENT. Sen. McIntyre reported on the saving of a N. H. wild river from urban encroachment and inserted newspaper article detailing community action which prevailed in preserving the natural stream. pp. S10069-70

HOUSE

7. COMMITTEE ACTION. The Agriculture Committee reported the following bills: S. 1455, providing for marketing orders for apples produced in Colorado, Utah, New Mexico, Illinois, and Ohio (H. Rept. No. 91-1246); S. 3598, loans for land conservation and utilization (H. Rept. No. 91-1247); S. 1456 amended, marketing orders applicable to apples for paid advertising (H. Rept. No. 91-1248); H. R. 11547 amended, increasing limitations on certain farm loans (H. Rept. No. 91-1249); H. R. 13978 amended, marketing research and promotion projects for almonds (H. Rept. No. 91-1250). p. H6194
8. SUBCOMMITTEES ACTIONS. Subcommittees of the Agriculture Committee approved for full committee consideration H. R. 11953, allowing FS to contract for aerial facilities for land protection and management, and S. 2484 amended, authorizing marketing agreements for the advertising of Hawaiian papayas. p. D700
9. TARIFFS. Agreed to the Senate amendments to H. R. 14720, continuing the suspension of duties on manganese ore. This bill now goes to the President. pp. H6123-4
10. MINERALS. Agreed to the conference report on H. R. 15833, disposal of acid grade fluorspar from the national stockpile. This bill now goes to the President. p. H6126
11. RIVER BASIN. An Interior and Insular Affairs Committee subcommittee approved for full committee action H. R. 16987 amended, authorizing the construction operation, and maintenance of the Minot extension, Garrison diversion unit, Missouri River Basin project. p. D701

be freed from the current stigma of being designed to promote the sale of U.S. goods. It should also carry the lowest possible interest rates.

The policy of joint ownership, with the Latin Americans in each country owning 51 percent of the stock in any corporate enterprise even if predominantly financed by American capital, has worked well in Mexico, to the advantage of both American and Mexican stockholders. It should become accepted practice. Expropriations of United States-owned properties and the resulting tensions would be eliminated.

Such changes in programming and authority would vest the responsibility in the Latin Americans. It does not mean, and should not mean, less participation by the United States, but a participation less conducive to friction and failure.

Two other changes are desirable. We should eliminate our bloated and needless military missions. They are largely paid vacation junkets for those who serve in them. Our military aid, moreover, has been misused repeatedly to overturn democratically elected and public-spirited regimes. The funds thus economized would be used for economic and social programs.

As Schlesinger points out, the Latin American population is multiplying faster than any in the world, and, as that most enlightened of Latin American statesmen, Alberto Lleras Camargo, former President of Colombia, has pointed out, no progress can be made unless it is checked. Indeed there would be regress. The breakthrough in public opinion and official attitudes on the subject of population control is so recent in our own glass house that we can scarcely throw stones southward. But family-planning groups now exist in every Latin American country, and they should be aided by U.S. funds.

Let us grant that the record in some Latin American countries for honest, enlightened self-government leaves much to be desired. With few exceptions the history of the Ibero-American nations has been an alternation of chaos, dictatorships, and occasional democratic regimes. The oligarchies stubbornly and effectively resist efforts to diminish their predatory status quo. But as Schlesinger makes so clear, the change can come only from the Latin Americans. Indeed, United States influence, despite pious pronouncements, has by and large favored the vested interests south of the border. Under the proposed shift of authority and responsibility to the Latin Americans, some funds will be misused and wasted, but so have they been under the present system. Self-government, self-help gain as they are given a fair chance. The change is worth trying.

The Latin Americans, now pretty well disillusioned, and understandably so, with our AID programs, would, I feel, welcome the change if they were convinced of its sincerity and that it implied no diminished interest on the part of the United States. United by a new overall sense of responsibility for their foreign-aided programs, they should be able to organize and present a solidarized front to secure more favorable treatment in the matter of tariffs and import quotas, especially for the products that are common to more than one country, as many are, and where their grievances have been legitimate. From the standpoint of U.S. interest their improved economies resulting from the success of such efforts would be beneficial to our export trade, although the freedom from American pressures incidental to receiving our aid would promote the importation of products from other countries. We should prepare ourselves, in the interest of improved hemispheric relations, to accept such competition.

I can only conceive of such a program of self-help and of a kind of autonomy and responsibility in decision-making to have valuable spiritual concomitants for Latin

America and a renaissance of good feeling in which the United States can share. The rebirth of good neighborliness is needed, as Nelson Rockefeller discovered.

(Former) SENATOR ERNEST GRUENING,
Democrat, Alaska,
Washington, D.C.

HIGHER EDUCATION—JOB WELL DONE BY SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE

Mr. EAGLETON. Mr. President, now that the Senate has completed action on H.R. 16916, the education appropriations bill, I would like to commend the members of the Appropriations Committee for their action in increasing the funds for the title II programs of the Higher Education Act which are so valuable to academic libraries. The bill passed by the Senate last week contains \$20,750,000 for part A, college library resources; \$8,250,000 for part B, library training; and \$7,500,000 for part C, the Library of Congress shared cataloging program. These figures represent a more realistic appropriation for academic library support and library science training than the amounts the House approved when that body acted on H.R. 16916 in April.

It is regrettable that the amounts for the three parts of this title were not specified in H.R. 16916. When the fiscal 1970 appropriations were being considered by the Senate, I attempted to have the funds for these and other programs earmarked in order to save them from the sweeping cuts which the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare was authorized to make. Unfortunately, the attempt was only partially successful; consequently, HEA title II funds were cut by far more than the 15-percent limitation placed on reductions in individual program funds specified in the bill. In fact, they suffered a 50-percent cut. I hope that in subsequent education appropriations bills it will be possible to spell out exactly how the title II money is to be apportioned among the three parts. In the meantime, however, I am pleased to see that my colleagues on the Appropriations Committee are so well aware of the importance of these library programs that they have restored the appropriations to a more reasonable level.

With so many issues and problems crying out for attention and solution, it is more crucial than ever that our college students, and those who teach them, have rapid access to the latest discoveries and developments in all fields.

The cost of all aspects of education has increased tremendously in the last few years. The budgets for library support in institutions of higher education are not adequate—not through lack of commitment to the essentiality of the library, but as a result of the difficulty most colleges and universities face in adequately supporting their many and equally pressing activities without outside help.

According to recent statistics, community colleges are being established at the rate of almost one a week. Last fall more students enrolled as freshmen in the community colleges of the Nation than in the 4-year colleges. Each of these students needs access to college li-

brary materials—relevant and up to date—if he is to succeed in his studies.

The librarian in one of these new community colleges faces the challenge of creating a library, or learning resource center, within 6 months to a year. This involves determining the goals of the institutional LRC, hiring personnel, training them, and in consort with the faculty and administration, developing the basic collection. It is critical to correlate the goals of the learning center with those of the institution. Hence, any future changes in the curriculum will alter the scope and collection of the library.

Grants under title II-A of the Higher Education Act have helped to provide materials at the proper reading level and in sufficient quantity to support the varied program of the college. Part A of title II of the present Higher Education Act authorizes grants to colleges of both the 2-year and 4-year variety. The statute authorizes basic grants, which must be matched, dollar-for-dollar, by the college, and it also authorizes supplemental and special purpose grants to enable those institutions in greatest need to purchase library materials.

Parts A and C of HEA title II represent an important attempt by the Federal Government to insure that academic libraries in both established institutions and new colleges can maintain, or acquire, a collection which can properly support the educational program.

Part B of this title aids not only our academic libraries, but every other type as well, through its training and research provisions. With new developments almost every day in the field of information science and documentation, it is imperative that extensive training and research be done in order to keep our librarians informed, so that they can provide the most efficient and effective service possible. These Federal programs under the Higher Education Act will help accomplish that end.

As research enables librarians to adopt new technological methods, the role of training additional professional personnel to accept and apply the new technology will become increasingly important. The funds we appropriate to carry on the library training and research programs under title II-B will help to keep us moving toward our goal of educational excellence and library service to meet the needs of the Nation.

I also want to commend the Appropriations Committee for its action in restoring funds for title VI of the Higher Education Act to the 1969 level. This enables colleges to purchase materials for laboratories, for audiovisual equipment, films, and records. It makes the difference between effective teaching or merely simulating. While this title was eliminated entirely in the House bill, I should like to point out that this program has been extremely effective over the years in enabling universities and colleges to modernize their laboratories and teaching equipment.

It is a matching program, and the modest amounts available in previous years have been well administered at both the local and Federal levels. While

many of our larger universities may not feel the loss of these funds to any great extent, the amounts allotted for purchases under this program have been of great importance to the Nation's small colleges, which are hard pressed to provide the quality type of instruction today's students demand.

I should further like to say that this is a program which does not appear divisible. The \$14.5 million when spread over several hundred schools does not leave a large amount for any single institution. If the total were further reduced, it might make it impossible for some small schools to apply for grants. The costs of the administrative and paper work involved would outweigh the money received.

I want to commend all of the members of the Appropriations Subcommittee that dealt with this bill and especially the chairman, Senator MAGNUSON, and Senator CORRON, the ranking minority member. There are education programs that I believe are deserving of increased funding and I am particularly disappointed that the Appropriations Committee and the full Senate decided against an appropriation for the payment of entitlements for public housing children under the impact aid program. Nevertheless, I believe that, in general, the subcommittee did an outstanding job in difficult circumstances. They worked diligently so that this bill could proceed as rapidly as possible and had the bill ready for floor action more than a month before the time it finally came up on the Senate floor. While I fully understand the circumstances that prevented earlier consideration of the bill, I believe it should be recognized that the Appropriations Committee was in no way responsible for the delay.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. President, on Friday, when the Senate considered H.R. 17868, the District of Columbia appropriations bill for fiscal 1971, I was unfortunately detained elsewhere in the Capitol and was unable to be in the Chamber for the brief discussion of the bill.

At this time, therefore, I wish to thank the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. PROXMIRE) and the entire Committee on Appropriations for bringing the bill before the Senate and securing its passage with such dispatch. This achievement is especially noteworthy since the committee was forced to act under severe constraints. The absence of new revenue authorization, either for operating expenditures or for capital outlays, gave us very few choices, allowed virtually no leeway, and forced us to defer many increases and new programs which are very meritorious indeed.

I am very much pleased that, despite this pinch, the Senate did amend H.R. 17868 to include funds for two projects which are of particular interest to the entire Metropolitan Washington area.

The first is the construction of the subway, or Metro system, for which an appropriation of \$34,178,000 was approved

by the Senate. The Metro system will be a real economic lifeline not only for the central city, but for the entire region. I believe it is so important that its construction should not be further delayed or made contingent upon any other projects.

The second project of particular concern to me is the improvement of the District of Columbia sewage treatment plant at Blue Plains, for which \$15.6 million was included in the Senate version of H.R. 17868. This project's objective goes beyond full secondary treatment to a high level of advanced waste treatment. It is essential if the District is ever going to meet its own water quality standards and if the Potomac River at Washington is ever going to be cleaned up.

In this connection, I am glad to report that, after a frustrating period of delays and failures of communications substantial progress is now being made in working out the details of Blue Plains improvement. For example, all of the jurisdictions involved—the District of Columbia, the State of Maryland, the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission, and the Department of the Interior—appeared last Thursday at a hearing of the Senate District of Columbia Committee and at that time endorsed in concept a "pay-as-you-go" approach to this project, under which capital costs will be allocated among the users of Blue Plains, and each will commit itself to pay its share when needed. This approach will greatly reduce the initial capital outlay required from District of Columbia funds.

Also at that hearing, the non-Federal agencies involved agreed to review new reports of two firms of consulting engineers and to meet again on July 10. At that time they will be prepared to reach firm agreement on whether or not to expand Blue Plains to provide short-term assistance for the Maryland suburban areas; precisely what advanced technology to employ in upgrading the plant; and exactly how costs are to be allocated. They will then proceed to present their combined plan to the Interior Department without further delay.

Let me emphasize that if the WSSC and the State of Maryland decide to support the expansion of Blue Plains, they voluntarily agreed and will be expected to bear the cost of construction to serve their needs. Under the "pay-as-you-go" approach, local District of Columbia appropriations will be used to improve service to District of Columbia residents. These improvements are overdue, and approval of the \$15.6 million in this bill is necessary to insure that this work can go forward this year.

Again, I wish to thank the Senator from Wisconsin for producing a sound and workable appropriations bill despite the revenue pinch which currently exists. As a member of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I intend to do everything I can to secure the prompt passage of the necessary authorization bills for the forthcoming year, so that District of Columbia appropriations for the year can be raised to more satisfactory levels.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BAYH). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ALLEN obtained the floor.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ALLEN. I yield.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, would the distinguished Senator mind delaying his remarks at this point? I ask this because under the order of Friday, it was agreed that no later than 11 a.m. today the Senate would consider the conference report on the second supplemental appropriation bill for 1970.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the action on the conference report on the second supplemental appropriation bill, I be recognized for not to exceed 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I thank the able Senator.

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1970—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 17399) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BAYH). The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The assistant legislative clerk read the report, as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 91-227)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 17399) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 6, 14, 23, 40, 41, 42, and 43.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 5, 7, 8, 11, 17, 18, 19, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, and 60, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "\$3,997,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$129,675"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$8,048,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "\$50,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 61: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 61, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$4,500,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 2, 10, 12, 13, 15, 16, 20, 22, 24, 50, 51, and 62.

ROBERT C. BYRD,
JOHN O. PASTORE,
SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
JOHN STENNIS,
ROMAN L. HRUSKA,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
MARGARET CHASE SMITH,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

GEORGE MAHON,
JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
JOE L. EVINS,
WILLIAM H. NATCHER,
DANIEL J. FLOOD,
TOM STEED,
JULIA BUTLER HANSEN,
CHARLES R. JONAS,
ELFORD CEDERBERG,
ROBERT H. MICHEL,
ODIN LANGEN,

Managers on the Part of the House.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 17399) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

TITLE I

CHAPTER I—DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Amendment No. 1: Provides \$425,000 by transfer for "Extension Service, Cooperative extension work, payments, and expenses" as proposed by the Senate instead of \$597,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 2: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate provision of \$300,000,000 for the "Food stamp program," with an amendment changing the date for the availability of such funds to cover a four instead of a three-month period of time. Funds so provided are to be charged to the amount provided in the 1971 bill for this purpose, when enacted. The \$300,000,000 does not necessarily have to be prorated over the four month period. These funds are required so that the food stamp program may be con-

tinued at about its current level pending enactment of authorizing legislation for the 1971 program, and the regular annual appropriation bill.

CHAPTER III—DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Amendment No. 3: Appropriates \$3,997,000 for "Federal payment to the District of Columbia" instead of \$5,831,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 4: Appropriates \$129,675 for "General operating expenses" instead of \$2,675 as proposed by the House and \$174,675 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 5: Appropriates \$3,966,485 for "Public safety" as proposed by the Senate instead of \$2,370,500 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 6: Deletes appropriation of \$1,789,000 for "Public safety" to assist in meeting costs associated with salary increases for policemen and firemen proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 7: Appropriates \$171,750 for "Parks and recreation" as proposed by the Senate instead of \$47,300 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 8: Appropriates \$20,000 for "Settlement of claims and suits" as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 9: Appropriates \$8,048,000 for "Capital outlay" instead of \$1,658,000 as proposed by the House and \$8,768,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 10: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment to provide that \$318,000 shall be available for construction services instead of \$374,500 as proposed by the Senate.

CHAPTER V—INDEPENDENT OFFICES

Amendment No. 11: Appropriates \$157,816,600 for "Payment to Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund" as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 12: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment to appropriate \$371,000 for the General Services Administration for sites and expenses of a public buildings project at Aberdeen, Mississippi.

Amendment No. 13: Reported in disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to insist on disagreement to the amendment of the Senate which proposes to appropriate an additional \$8,800,000 for the National Science Foundation for fiscal year 1970.

Amendment No. 14: Appropriates \$7,000,000 for the "Selective Service System" as proposed by the House instead of \$7,433,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 15: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to appropriate \$350,000 for the "Council of Environmental Quality and Office of Environmental Quality", instead of \$100,000 as proposed by the House and \$400,000 as proposed by the Senate.

* DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

Amendment No. 16: Reported in disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to insist on disagreement to the amendment of the Senate which proposes to appropriate an additional \$587,500,000 for Urban Renewal Programs for fiscal year 1970.

CHAPTER VI—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Amendment No. 17: Appropriates \$225,000 for "Geological Survey, surveys, investigations, and research" as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 18: Appropriates \$775,000 for "National Park Service, Management and Protection" as proposed by the Senate instead of \$850,000 as proposed by the House.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Amendment No. 19: Appropriates \$21,172,000 for "Forest Protection and Utilization, Forest Land Management" as proposed by the Senate instead of \$21,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 20: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur with the Senate amendment which provides that \$172,000 of funds appropriated for "Forest Land Management" shall remain available until expended.

CHAPTER VII—DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Amendment No. 21: Appropriates \$50,000,000 for "Manpower development and training activities" instead of \$100,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 22: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment to appropriate \$2,330,000 for "Trade Adjustment Activities".

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Amendment No. 23: Deletes item proposed by the Senate to appropriate \$8,703,078 for "Hospital Modernization and Construction."

CHAPTER VIII—LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

Amendment No. 24: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment to provide \$345,000 for "Contingent expenses of the Senate, Inquiries and Investigations" by transfer from another Senate account.

CHAPTER X—DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, AND COMMERCE, THE JUDICIARY AND RELATED AGENCIES

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Amendment No. 25: Appropriates \$500,000 for "Fees and expenses of witnesses" as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 26: Appropriates \$850,000 for "Support of United States prisoners" as proposed by the Senate.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Amendment No. 27: Appropriates \$145,000 for "State marine schools" as proposed by the Senate.

RELATED AGENCIES

Amendment No. 28: Inserts title as proposed by the Senate.

CHAPTER XI—DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Amendment No. 29: Appropriates \$1,000,000 for "Coast Guard, Retired Pay" as proposed by the Senate instead of \$1,250,000 as proposed by the House.

CHAPTER XII—TREASURY DEPARTMENT

Amendment No. 30: Appropriates \$1,300,000 for "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Accounts" as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 31: Appropriates \$3,600,000 for the Bureau of the Public Debt for "Administering the public debt" as proposed by the Senate instead of \$3,250,000 as proposed by the House.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Amendment No. 32: Appropriates \$10,600,000 for "Transportation" as proposed by the Senate instead of \$10,700,000 as proposed by the House.

TAX COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Amendment No. 33: Appropriates \$67,000 for the Tax Court of the United States as proposed by the Senate instead of \$83,000 as proposed by the House.

CHAPTER XIII—CLAIMS AND JUDGMENTS

Amendments Nos. 34 and 35: Appropriate \$23,478,461 for claims and judgments as proposed by the Senate instead of \$6,591,406 as proposed by the House, including those in Senate Document Numbered 91-86.

TITLE II

INCREASED PAY COSTS

Amendment No. 36: Appropriates \$4,495,-874 for various Senate items as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 37: Appropriates \$43,475 for "Joint Economic Committee" as proposed by the Senate instead of \$44,490 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 38: Appropriates \$146,300 for "Senate office buildings" and \$3,400 for "Senate garage" as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 39: Appropriates \$502,500,-000 for "Military personnel, Air Force" as proposed by the Senate instead of \$485,000,-000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 40: Appropriates \$196,480,-000 for "Operation and maintenance, Army" as proposed by the House instead of \$206,-900,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 41: Appropriates \$157,800,-000 for "Operation and maintenance, Navy" as proposed by the House instead of \$166,-100,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 42: Appropriates \$70,400,-000 for "Operation and maintenance, Defense agencies" as proposed by the House instead of \$74,200,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 43: Appropriates \$13,800,-000 for "Operation and maintenance, Army National Guard" as proposed by the House instead of \$14,800,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 44: Appropriates \$3,681,000 for the National Park Service, "Management and protection", as proposed by the Senate instead of \$3,359,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 45: Increases by \$55,000 the limitation on administrative expenses for the Federal Prison Industries, Incorporated, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 46, 47 and 48: Make technical language changes to change the format of items as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 49: Appropriates \$1,940,000 for "United States Secret Service" as proposed by the Senate instead of \$1,740,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 50: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment making \$200,000 for the U.S. Secret Service available upon enactment of H.R. 17138, or similar legislation, with an amendment changing the citation.

Amendment No. 51: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment providing \$42,000 by transfer for "Salaries and expenses" of the Appalachian Regional Commission to cover increased pay costs.

(OUT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FUNDS)

Amendment No. 52: Appropriates \$2,229,-000 for "General operating expenses" as proposed by the Senate instead of \$1,932,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 53: Appropriates \$2,324,-000 for "Public safety" as proposed by the Senate instead of \$1,780,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 54: Appropriates \$899,000 for "Parks and recreation" as proposed by the Senate instead of \$652,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 55: Appropriates \$4,624,000 for "Health and welfare" as proposed by the Senate instead of \$4,478,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 56: Appropriates \$1,905,000 for "Sanitary engineering" as proposed by the Senate instead of \$1,096,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 57, 58, 59 and 60: Provide that \$12,191,000 shall be paid from the general fund as proposed by the Senate instead of \$10,332,000 as proposed by the House; \$535,000 shall be paid from the highway

fund (regular) as proposed by the Senate instead of \$533,000 as proposed by the House; \$468,000 shall be paid from the water fund as proposed by the Senate instead of \$375,000 as proposed by the House; and \$339,000 shall be paid from the sanitary sewage works fund as proposed by the Senate instead of \$250,000 as proposed by the House.

TITLE V

LIMITATION ON FISCAL YEAR 1971 BUDGET OUTLAYS

Amendment No. 61: In connection with the overall government ceiling on fiscal 1971 budget outlays (expenditures and net lending), the House bill contained a \$3,000,000,000 "cushion" for necessary expenditures beyond the estimates in the February 2 budget for certain designated uncontrollables (mainly interest on the debt, the various social insurance trust funds, and farm price supports). These are some of the items as to which the Congress is not required to act upon annually in the appropriations bills. The Senate raised this "cushion" for uncontrollable overruns to \$6,000,000,000. The conferees have agreed upon \$4,500,000,000.

TITLE VI

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Amendment No. 62: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment in order to validate obligations incurred between July 1, 1970, and 5 days following approval of the act.

GEORGE MAHON,
JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
JOE L. EVINS,
WILLIAM H. NATCHER,
DANIEL J. FLOOD,
TOM STEED,
JULIA BUTLER HANSEN,
CHARLES R. JONAS,
ELFORD CEDERBERG,
ROBERT H. MICHEL,
ODIN LANGEN,

Managers on the Part of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the printed conference report on the second supplemental appropriation bill, 1970, is available for examination by all of the Members. This bill has been pending for some time and, as you know, there is a detailed House report and a detailed Senate report available describing each item. It has been debated in both Houses extensively; consequently, I will confine my remarks to a brief summary of the important items contained in the conference report.

The Senate on June 22, when it passed this bill, included \$300 million for the food stamp program, which amount is to be charged to the amount appropriated under this head in the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill when it is enacted. The Senate provided that these funds would be available for the period July 1, 1970, to September 30, 1970. Upon the suggestion of the managers on the part of the House, the amendment was rewritten in conference to provide that the funds would be available until October 31, 1970. The fact that the date was changed, extending the period by 1 month, does not in any way subtract from the amount which could be used during an earlier month. The Department of Agriculture appro-

priation bill, as it passed the House of Representatives, contains \$1,250,000,000 for this program, and the Senate Appropriations Committee is marking up this bill today. It can therefore reasonably be expected that it will pass the Senate in early July.

The Senate, on the motion of the distinguished majority leader, included in the bill \$8.8 million for the National Science Foundation. The conferees on the part of the House were unwilling to recommend this or any part of this sum to the House; and the House of Representatives has now sustained their position. I see no alternative except for the Senate to recede on this amendment No. 13. However, I desire to advise the Senate that the sum of \$8.8 million for this same agency has been included in the independent offices appropriation bill, which has already been reported to the Senate.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield at that point?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. The budget estimate for the National Science Foundation for fiscal 1971 was \$511 million. The House cut it by \$16 million. The Senate had quite a conference on it, in our own committee in executive session, and it was the consensus that if the \$8.8 million was based on the supplemental bill, that amount would be deducted from the reclama—in other words, we would not reclaim the \$16 million but would reclaim the difference between the \$8.8 million and the \$16 million. That was the consensus. No vote was taken. That is what would have happened. So if this had passed, what we have put back on the National Science Foundation covers this amount. If this had passed we would have deducted it from the \$16 million. I do not think there will be any trouble with it at all.

Mr. MANSFIELD. If the Senator will yield, I appreciate the explanation given by both the chairman of the supplemental subcommittee and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PASTORE). I had hoped, as a symbol to the research and academic community of the good faith and good intent of the Congress, that we could have separately inserted into the supplemental bill this year the relatively small amount of research funds eliminated directly by the implementation of section 203 of the Military Procurement Act of 1970; the important fact however is that the Senate has demonstrated by the initial passage of this \$8.8 million its desire to follow through on the thrust of section 203 and to assure that funds eliminated by section 203 will be added to the National Science Foundation in the appropriation for this coming year; I understand fully how this amendment was caught in the vise along with the other Senate amendment adding funds for urban renewal. I know how sincerely and diligently the Senate conferees on both sides of the Senate aisle fought for the item. But in view of The House action taking a specific and separate vote by the full House rejecting overwhelmingly first the urban renewal funds added by the Senate and then by a voice

vote rejecting this amendment for NSF we have to accept that parliamentary reality. But I am reassured by the fact that the independent offices appropriations for the coming year will come before the Senate next week, and the issue of the National Science Foundation appropriations will be again before the Senate. With the effort made by the Senate on this amendment, and the assurances of the chairman of that subcommittee (Mr. PASTORE), a most responsible attitude is assured that the appropriate amount of additional funds will be added to NSF not only to account for those affected by section 203 but hopefully as well to account in addition for those funds eliminated for general budgetary reasons by other mission agencies for basic research during the past year.

Mr. PASTORE. The conferees of the Senate agreed with the position of the majority leader and the manager of the conference. The Senator from West Virginia actually exhausted himself trying to get it restored. However, we were hitting our heads up against a stone wall. We did the best we could.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I have every confidence in the distinguished Senator from West Virginia (Mr. BYRD), and I also have every confidence in the members of the conference committee representing the Senate, both Democrats and Republicans. I know that they did their best. I have no complaint with their efforts. We tried. I do not consider their efforts a failure; rather, the issue has been postponed for the time being. Hopefully, it will be before the Senate within a week and our efforts will be successful the next time.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I thank the distinguished majority leader and I also thank the able Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PASTORE). The purposes as outlined by the majority leader will be accomplished.

There was considerable interest in the Senate the other evening on the appropriation for the Council on Environmental Quality and Office of Environmental Quality. The Committee on Appropriations had recommended an appropriation of \$200,000 and the Senate saw fit to increase the amount to \$400,000. During the conference, we agreed with the House that an appropriation of \$350,000 would be available to this Council.

One of the most controversial items in this bill was the \$587,500,000 for urban renewal programs. This sum was included in the bill in the Senate on a rollcall vote of 70-12. The House managers were adamant in their position, as were the Senate conferees, and the amendment was in actual disagreement. The House has now rejected, on a vote of 236 to 136, to concur in the amendment of the Senate, so I see no alternative but that the Senate recede from its amendment No. 16.

I have discussed this with the Senator from Rhode Island and he may wish me to yield to him at this point for whatever comments he may wish to make.

Mr. PASTORE. Yes, if the Senator will yield, there is a sense of agony which I experience when I speak on this sub-

ject because, first of all, I remember during the last session of Congress that this question came up, as to picking up the remainder of the authorization for fiscal year 1970, which was \$587.5 million. We took a vote at that time, and what we actually did by the vote, we postponed consideration of this until the next supplement bill. Then, on my amendment, we put the \$587.5 million back in the bill. I thought the Senate did the right thing. I am taking the position today, rather reluctantly, being pragmatic about it, that there is no other alternative we can take. The House has spoken. A great injustice has been dealt the cities.

We have been talking about the decay in the cities and giving them a new face. Many of the mayors appeared before the committee to discuss the regular bill and said that if we funded the authorizations up to their full extent, there would be no question in their minds that within a period of 5 years we would eliminate the ghettos from this country. Well, that became a subject of laugh-ability in the conference, for some reason which I cannot understand. But, be that as it may, I insisted that they bring it back in disagreement, in the hope that we could reach the mayors' interest and get them before the committee again so that they could give us their advice. I do not know how far or how effective the committee went, but if we are not able to convince them now—they have been already fortified by a vote of a 100 majority—I do not see how we could ever have it restored, but we have the other weapon at our disposal. The committee, in the regular bill, reported \$300 million over and above the estimate, which is \$1 billion, which was passed by the House for fiscal year 1971. There is remaining in the authorization for fiscal year 1971 \$700 million, which means \$400 million can be added on to the \$300 million that has been added on. Now, what experience we will have in conference, even if that happens, I do not know.

I do want to say that I sincerely hope that regardless of what we do, the mayors who were so convincing before our committee in encouraging us to add \$587.5 million, speak to their own representatives who voted against the increase. And if they cannot do that, I do not see how we can do it.

After all, we are the judges and the masters of our own consciences and of our own action. We cannot govern the activity of the House. The House has spoken. The House has disagreed with us. The conference has disagreed with us.

It was, I repeat, as though we were hitting our heads up against a stone wall. That action has now been fortified by the action of the House with a majority of 100 votes.

One thing that I loath to do is to get myself involved in exercises of futility. That is what this would amount to.

So, with a sad heart and in a spirit of agony, I say that we should forget this and try it again the next time.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, how much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, would the Senator from New York allow me to finish my statement.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, my remarks properly would come at this point.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Very well.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, it is amazing to me that we have an urban country and a rural House of Representatives. That is what it comes down to.

The House appears to be absolutely without knowledge concerning the problems of the cities both large and small and the fact that these tangible improvements are not inflationary. They add to the wealth of the country.

What is dragging our country down at this time is that construction has fallen off markedly.

I pay tribute to the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PASTORE) and to the conferees. They all demonstrated very strong support and would not agree with the House position. However, the House had the votes to insist on its disagreement. No fault is to be found on the part of the conferees.

The Senator from Michigan (Mr. HART) and I feel that we must seek the whole amount which is authorized for urban renewal, \$2,287.5 billion which would require an additional \$987.5 million to be added to the 1971 bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BAYH). The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished Senator from New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized for an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I know that the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PASTORE) will be stalwart in whatever he can do on this issue in the 1971 bill.

Finally, we feel that it is our duty to try to secure the full authorization for urban renewal.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, in reply to the Senator, I wish to state that it is true that there is more of a rural aspect to the House than to the Senate. But there were conferees in that conference that did not have projects for their localities submitted or funded. That did not affect them.

I say to the mayors who live in the congressional districts represented by these Representatives that if they cannot convince their Congressmen what it means for their home towns, I am afraid that I am wasting my time.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I agree. The House action was a tragic thing. I thank the Senator from West Virginia for his courtesy in yielding.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the Committee on Appropriations had originally recommended the sum of \$50 million for the manpower development and training activities, usually referred to as the summer jobs program, and the Senate on last Monday evening

increased the sum to \$100 million. The able Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS) offered the amendment to increase the amount by \$50 million. The Senate committee approved of the amendment and the Senate agreed to the amendment. The Senate conferees were faced with the adamant position of the managers on the part of the House that the sum should not exceed the amount of the budget estimate and, consequently, we agreed to recommend to the Senate \$50 million for this program.

I regret to advise the Senate that the

\$8,703,078 included in the bill by the Senate committee, and approved by the Senate, for hospital modernization and construction had to be deleted from the bill. The managers on the part of the House were vigorously opposed to this amendment, pointing out that the sum was to be used without regard to title VI of the Public Health Service Act, and we were faced with no alternative other than to recede.

Mr. President, I believe these are the major items in the conference report. I ask unanimous consent to have a tabulation which gives the full details printed

in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BAYH). Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I think it should be of interest to Senators to note that the final conference action on this bill amounts to \$6,-021,535,005.

The budget estimate was in the amount of \$6,580,171,902.

So the final action is something like \$558 million under the budget estimate.

EXHIBIT 1.—2D SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1970 (H.R. 17399)

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL

H. Doc. or S. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimate	House version of bill	Senate version of bill	Final action
TITLE I—GENERAL SUPPLEMENTALS					
CHAPTER I—DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE					
Extension Service					
91-272	Cooperative Extension work, payments and expenses (by transfer).....	(\$597,000)	(\$597,000)	(\$425,000)	(\$425,000)
	Food and Nutrition Service food stamp program.....			(300,000,000)	(300,000,000)
CHAPTER II—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—MILITARY					
Retired Military Personnel					
91-272	Retired pay, Defense, new budget (obligational) authority.....	99,000,000	99,000,000	99,000,000	99,000,000
CHAPTER III—DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA					
Federal Funds					
91-288 and S. Doc. 91-82	Federal payment to District of Columbia.....	5,831,000		5,831,000	3,997,000
91-272	Loans to the District of Columbia for capital outlay.....	1,293,000	1,293,000	1,293,000	1,293,000
	Total, Federal funds.....	7,124,000	1,293,000	7,124,000	5,290,000
District of Columbia Funds					
91-288 and S. Doc. 91-82	General operating expenses.....	(202,000)	(2,675)	(174,675)	(129,675)
91-288 and S. Doc. 91-82	Public Safety.....	(6,892,000)	(2,370,000)	(5,755,485)	(3,966,485)
91-288	Education.....	(2,500,000)			
91-288 and S. Doc. 91-82	Parks and recreation.....	(234,000)	(47,300)	(171,750)	(171,750)
S. Doc. 91-82	Health and welfare.....	(2,850,000)			
S. Doc. 91-82	Settlement of claims and suits.....	(20,000)		(20,000)	(20,000)
91-272, 91- 288, and S. Doc. 91-82	Capital outlay.....	(8,768,000)	(1,658,000)	(8,768,000)	(8,048,000)
	Total, District of Columbia funds.....	(21,466,000)	(4,078,475)	(14,889,910)	(12,335,910)
	Total, chapter III, new budget (obligational) authority.....	7,124,000	1,293,000	7,124,000	5,290,000
CHAPTER IV—FOREIGN OPERATIONS					
Funds appropriated to the President					
Foreign assistance					
S. Doc. 91-67	Foreign military credit sales.....	275,000,000			
Peace Corps					
91-272	Salaries and expenses (increase in limitation).....	(349,000)			
International Financial Institution					
91-272	Investment in Inter-American Development Bank.....	205,880,000	\$205,880,000	205,880,000	205,880,000
	Total, chapter IV, new budget (obligational) authority.....	480,880,000	205,880,000	205,880,000	205,880,000
	Increase in limitation.....	(349,000)			
CHAPTER V—INDEPENDENT OFFICES					
Civil Service Commission					
91-306	Federal Labor Relations Council: Salaries and expenses.....	Language	Language	Language	Language
S. Doc. 91-84	Payment to Civil Service retirement and disability fund.....	157,816,600		157,816,600	157,816,600
Commission on population growth and the American future					
91-273	Salaries and expenses.....	1,433,000	965,000	965,000	965,000
General Services Administration					
Real property activities					
S. Doc. 91-67	Sites and expenses, public buildings projects.....	371,000		371,000	371,000
National Science Foundation					
	Salaries and expenses.....			8,800,000	

Footnotes at end of table.

H. Doc. or S. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimate	House version of bill	Senate version of bill	Final action
Selective Service System					
91-272	Salaries and expenses.....	7,433,000	\$7,000,000	\$7,433,000	\$7,000,000
Veterans' Administration					
91-272	Compensation and pensions.....	273,045,000	273,045,000	273,045,000	273,045,000
91-272	Readjustment benefits.....	330,500,000	327,500,000	327,500,000	327,500,000
91-312					
91-272	Medical care.....	106,500,000	113,500,000	113,500,000	113,500,000
1-293					
	Total, Veterans' Administration.....	710,045,000	714,045,000	714,045,000	714,045,000
Executive Office of the President					
Council on Environmental Quality and Office of Environmental Quality					
S. Doc. 91-67	Salaries and expenses.....	600,000	100,000	400,000	350,000
Funds appropriated to the President					
91-272	Disaster Relief.....	100,000,000	75,000,000	75,000,000	75,000,000
DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT					
Renewal and housing assistance					
91-272	Urban renewal programs.....			587,500,000	
	Low rent public housing annual contributions:				
	1969.....	13,616,000	13,616,000	13,616,000	13,616,000
	1970.....	6,500,000			
91-272	College Housing (annual contract authorization, increase in limitation).....	(5,500,000)	(5,000,000)	(5,000,000)	(5,000,000)
Mortgage credit					
91-273	Homeownership and rental housing assistance (annual contract authorizations, increase in limitation):				
	Homeownership assistance.....	(25,000,000)	(35,000,000)	(35,000,000)	(35,000,000)
	Rental housing assistance.....	(25,000,000)	(35,000,000)	(35,000,000)	(35,000,000)
	Total, Department of Housing and Urban Development:				
	1969.....	13,616,000	13,616,000	13,616,000	13,616,000
	1970.....	6,500,000		587,500,000	
	Total.....	20,116,000	13,616,000	601,116,000	13,616,000
	New annual contract authorization, increase in limitation.....	(55,500,000)	(75,000,000)	(57,000,000)	(75,000,000)
Total, chapter V:					
	New budget (obligational) authority:				
	1969.....	13,616,000	13,616,000	13,616,000	13,616,000
	1970.....	984,198,600	797,110,000	1,552,330,600	955,547,600
	Total.....	997,814,600	810,726,000	1,565,946,600	969,163,600
	New annual contract authorization, increase in limitation.....	(55,500,000)	(75,000,000)	(75,000,000)	(75,000,000)
CHAPTER VI—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR					
Public Land Management					
Bureau of Land Management					
91-272	Management of lands and resources.....	23,790,000	23,790,000	23,790,000	23,790,000
Bureau of Indian Affairs					
91-272	Resources management.....	700,000	700,000	700,000	700,000
Bureau of Outdoor Recreation					
91-272	Land and water conservation.....	7,100,000	7,100,000	7,100,000	7,100,000
Office of Territories					
91-272	Administration of territories.....	275,000	275,000	275,000	275,000
Mineral Resources					
Geological Survey					
S. Doc. 91-67	Surveys, investigations and research.....	300,000		225,000	225,000
Fish and Wildlife, Parks, and Marine Resources					
National Park Service					
91-272	Management and protection.....	850,000	850,000	775,000	775,000
RELATED AGENCIES—DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE					
Forest Service					
91-272	Forest protection and utilization.....	21,000,000	21,000,000	21,172,000	21,172,000
National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities					
91-272	Salaries and expenses.....	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
	Total, chapter VI, new budget (obligational) authority.....	56,015,000	55,715,000	56,037,000	56,037,000
CHAPTER VII—DEPARTMENT OF LABOR					
Manpower Administration					
S. Doc. 91-89	Manpower development and training activities.....	50,000,000		100,000,000	50,000,000
Bureau of Employment Security					
91-272	Unemployment compensation for Federal employees and ex-servicemen.....	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000	50,000,000
S. Doc. 91-67	Trade adjustment activities.....	2,330,000		2,330,000	2,330,000
91-272	Limitation on grants to States for unemployment compensation and employment service administration.....	(10,000,000)	(10,000,000)	(10,000,000)	(10,000,000)
Wage and Labor Standards Administration					
91-272	Salaries and expenses.....	37,000	37,000	37,000	37,000
	Longshoremen's and harbor workers' compensation fund (by transfer).....	(43,000)	(43,000)	(43,000)	(43,000)

Footnotes at end of table.

EXHIBIT 1.—2D SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1970 (H.R. 17399)—Continued

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL—Continued

H. Doc. or S. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimate	House version of bill	Senate version of bill	Final action
TITLE I—GENERAL SUPPLEMENTALS—Continued					
CHAPTER VII—DEPARTMENT OF LABOR—Continued					
Office of the Secretary					
91-272	Federal contract compliance and civil rights program, salaries and expenses.....	\$160,000	\$107,000	\$107,000	\$107,000
	Total, Department of Labor.....	102,527,000	50,144,000	152,474,000	102,474,000
	By transfer.....	(43,000)	(43,000)	(43,000)	(43,000)
	Limitation (trust fund).....	(10,000,000)	(10,000,000)	(10,000,000)	(10,000,000)
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE					
Health Services and Mental Health Administration					
	Hospital construction.....			8,703,078	
Office of Education					
S. Doc. 91-83	Emergency school assistance.....	150,000,000			
Social and Rehabilitation Service					
91-272	Grants to States for public assistance.....	146,753,000	146,753,000	146,753,000	146,753,000
Special Institutions					
91-272	Howard University, construction.....	7,700,000	7,700,000	7,700,000	7,700,000
	Total, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.....	304,453,000	154,453,000	163,156,078	154,453,000
	Total, chapter VII:				
	New budget (obligational) authority.....	406,980,000	204,597,000	315,630,078	256,927,000
	By transfer.....	(43,000)	(43,000)	(43,000)	(43,000)
	Limitation (trust fund).....	(10,000,000)	(10,000,000)	(10,000,000)	(10,000,000)
CHAPTER VIII—LEGISLATIVE BRANCH					
Senate					
Contingent expenses					
	Expenses of inquiries and investigations (by transfer).....			(345,000)	(345,000)
House of Representatives					
Salaries, mileage for the Members, and expense allowance of the Speaker					
91-272	Compensation of Members.....	47,000	47,000	47,000	47,000
Salaries, officers and employees					
91-306	Committee on Appropriations (investigations).....	35,555	35,555	35,555	35,555
Contingent expenses of the House					
91-306	Miscellaneous items.....	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
91-272	Special and select committees.....	500,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
	Total, House of Representatives.....	632,555	232,555	232,555	232,555
General Accounting Office					
91-272	Salaries and expenses.....	499,000	499,000	499,000	499,000
	Total, chapter VIII, new budget (obligational) authority.....	1,131,555	731,555	731,555	731,555
	By transfer.....			(345,000)	(345,000)
CHAPTER IX—PUBLIC WORKS					
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR					
Bureau of Reclamation					
91-306	Colorado River Basin project (by transfer).....	(6,563,000)	(6,563,000)	(6,563,000)	(6,563,000)
CHAPTER X—DEPARTMENT OF STATE					
International Organizations and Conferences					
91-272	Contributions to international organizations.....	1,800,000	1,600,000	1,600,000	1,600,000
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE					
Legal Activities and General Administration					
S. Doc. 91-67	Fees and expenses of witnesses.....	500,000		500,000	500,000
Immigration and Naturalization Service					
91-272	Salaries and expenses.....	892,000	892,000	892,000	892,000
Federal Prison System					
S. Doc. 91-67	Support of U.S. prisoners.....	850,000		850,000	850,000
	Total, Department of Justice.....	2,242,000	892,000	2,242,000	2,242,000
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE					
Bureau of the Census					
91-272	19th decennial census.....	11,000,000	11,000,000	11,000,000	11,000,000
Office of Field Services					
91-272	Salaries and expenses.....	105,000	105,000	105,000	105,000
Maritime Administration					
S. Doc. 91-67	State marine schools.....	145,000		145,000	145,000
	Total, Department of Commerce.....	11,250,000	11,105,000	11,250,000	11,250,000

Footnotes at end of table.

H. Doc. or S. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimate	House version of bill	Senate version of bill	Final action
THE JUDICIARY					
Customs Court					
91-272	Salaries and expenses.....	\$60,500	\$18,000	\$18,000	\$18,000
Courts of Appeals, District Courts, and Other Judicial Services					
91-272	Salaries and expenses, United States magistrates.....	560,000	550,000	550,000	550,000
91-272	Salaries of supporting personnel.....	145,000			
Fees and expenses of court-appointed counsel:					
91-272	1970.....	1,150,000	1,150,000	1,150,000	1,150,000
91-273	1969.....	300,000	300,000	300,000	300,000
91-272	Fees of jurors and commissioners.....	800,000	500,000	500,000	500,000
91-272	Travel and miscellaneous expenses.....	625,000	500,000	500,000	500,000
91-272	Administrative Office of the United States Courts.....	50,000	15,000	15,000	15,000
91-272	Expenses of referees.....	34,000			
Total, courts of appeals, district courts, and other judicial services.....		3,664,000	3,015,000	3,015,000	3,015,000
Total the Judiciary:					
1970.....		3,424,500	2,733,000	2,733,000	2,733,000
1969.....		300,000	300,000	300,000	300,000
Total.....		3,724,500	3,033,000	3,033,000	3,033,000
RELATED AGENCIES—DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE					
Office of Education					
91-272	Civil rights education.....	10,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000
Special Representative for Trade Negotiations					
91-272	Salaries and expenses.....	60,000			
Total related agencies.....		10,060,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000
Total chapter X:					
New budget (obligational) authority:					
1969.....		300,000	300,000	300,000	300,000
1970.....		28,776,500	21,330,000	22,825,000	22,825,000
Total.....		29,076,500	21,630,000	23,125,000	23,125,000
CHAPTER XI—DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION					
Coast Guard					
91-306	Retired pay.....	1,250,000	1,250,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
RELATED AGENCY					
Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority					
91-272	Federal Contribution.....	82,939,000	82,939,000	82,939,000	82,939,000
Total Chapter XI new budget (obligational) authority.....		84,189,000	84,189,000	83,939,000	83,939,000
CHAPTER XII—TREASURY DEPARTMENT					
Bureau of Accounts					
S. Doc. 91-67	Salaries and expenses.....	1,320,000		1,300,000	1,300,000
Bureau of the Public Debt					
91-272 and S. Doc. 91-67.	Administering the Public Debt.....	3,600,000	3,250,000	3,600,000	3,600,000
Total, Treasury Department.....		4,920,000	3,250,000	4,900,000	4,900,000
POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT					
(Out of Postal Fund)					
91-272	Transportation.....	10,700,000	10,700,000	10,600,000	10,600,000
INDEPENDENT AGENCY					
Tax Court of the United States					
91-272	Salaries and expenses.....	83,000	83,000	67,000	67,000
Total, Chapter XII, new budget (obligational) authority.....		15,703,000	14,033,000	15,567,000	15,567,000
CHAPTER XIII					
Claims and Judgments					
91-315 and S. Doc. 91-86.	Claims and judgments.....	23,478,461	6,591,406	23,478,461	23,478,461
Total, Title I—General Supplementals:					
New budget (obligational) authority:					
1969.....		13,916,000	13,916,000	13,916,000	13,916,000
1970.....		2,187,476,116	1,490,469,961	2,382,542,694	2,175,222,616
Total.....		2,201,392,116	1,504,385,961	2,396,458,694	2,179,138,616
New annual contract authorizations, increase in limitations.....		(55,500,000)	(75,000,000)	(75,000,000)	(75,000,000)
By transfer.....		(7,203,000)	(7,203,000)	(7,376,000)	(7,376,000)
Limitation on administrative expenses.....		(10,349,000)	(10,000,000)	(10,000,000)	(10,000,000)
TITLE II—INCREASED PAY COSTS					
91-272	Total, title II:				
S. Doc. 91-67,	New budget (obligational) authority.....	3,028,779,786	2,909,729,830	2,955,916,389	2,932,396,389
S. Doc. 91-82	By transfer.....	(42,263,000)	(42,181,900)	(42,223,900)	(42,223,900)
Limitation on administrative and nonadministrative expenses.....		(37,927,000)	(36,225,700)	(36,280,700)	(36,280,700)
TITLE III					
Increased pay costs—Federal Employees Salary Act of 1970 (indefinite).....		4,135,000,000	4,135,000,000	4,135,000,000	4,135,000,000
Grand total, titles II and III—Increased pay costs:					
New budget (obligational) authority:					
Definite.....		3,028,779,786	2,909,729,830	2,955,916,389	2,932,396,389
Indefinite.....		4,135,000,000	4,135,000,000	4,135,000,000	4,135,000,000
Total.....		4,378,779,786	4,259,729,830	4,305,916,389	4,282,396,389
By transfer.....		(42,263,000)	(42,181,900)	(42,223,900)	(42,223,900)
Limitations on administrative and nonadministrative expenses.....		(37,927,000)	(36,225,700)	(36,280,700)	(36,280,700)

Footnotes at end of table.

EXH/BIT 1.—2D SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1970 (H.R. 17399)—Continued

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF NEW BUDGET (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL—Continued

H. Doc. or S. Doc. No.	Department or activity	Budget estimate	House version of bill	Senate version of bill	Final action
RECAPITULATION					
	Grand total, Titles I, II, and III: New budget (obligational) authority:	\$13,916,000	\$13,916,000	\$13,916,000	\$13,916,000
	Fiscal year 1969.....	5,216,255,902	4,400,199,791	25,338,459,083	24,657,619,005
	Fiscal year 1970:	1,350,000,000	1,350,000,000	1,350,000,000	1,350,000,000
	Definite.....	6,566,255,902	5,750,199,791	26,688,459,083	26,007,619,005
	Indefinite.....	6,580,171,902	5,764,115,791	26,702,375,083	6,021,535,005
	Total, fiscal year 1970.....	(55,500,000)	(75,000,000)	(75,000,000)	(75,000,000)
	Total, new budget (obligational) authority.....	(49,466,000)	(49,384,900)	(49,599,900)	(49,599,900)
	New annual contract authorizations, increase in limitations.....	(48,276,000)	(46,225,700)	(46,280,700)	(46,280,700)
	By transfer.....				
	Limitations on administrative and nonadministrative expenses.....				

¹ And in addition the reserve fund of \$200,000 under this head, fiscal year 1970, may be used for increased pay costs.

² Excludes \$300,000,000 for food stamp programs, which sum is charged against figure in Agricultural Appropriation Bill, 1971.

³ Reflects reduction of \$23,520,000 under the Senate-passed bill for operation and maintenance, Department of Defense.

⁴ Estimate of cost for the 6 months the 6 percent retroactive pay bill would be in effect during

fiscal 1970. Under the bill language, transfers of certain unobligated balances are authorized to help meet the added costs, and some absorptions otherwise are probable. Thus, the aggregate additional appropriation under this provision may actually be less than \$1,350,000,000.

Note.—In terms of the February budget aggregates for 1970, the net additional amount is \$1,175,000,000, after taking account of the \$175,000,000 allowance in the February budget total related to a postal pay raise.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I oppose the amendment to provide an additional \$587.5 million for urban renewal. The item is not supported by the administration, and has been rejected adamantly by the House, not only in conference, but also by a very substantial vote on the floor.

As suggested by the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PASTORE), we should recognized the practicalities of the situation and proceed with the final consideration of the conference report. The bill contains many items urgently needed before tomorrow night, which marks the end of the fiscal year.

Mr. President, the Senate should recede on this \$587.5 million amendment for the following reasons.

First, it was not requested in the President's budget.

Second, no hearings have been held on it, in either Senate or House committee.

Third, it is not properly a supplemental item.

Fourth, none of it can be spent this fiscal year, which ends tomorrow.

Fifth, the appropriation bill for 1971 as passed by the House contains the budget estimate of \$1 billion for this program. The bill reported by the Senate Appropriations Committee provides for \$1.3 billion. That bill is now on the calendar and will be acted upon at a very early time.

Sixth, the crisis in the cities, which I both acknowledge and deplore, is matched by a national crisis in our fiscal situation.

Seventh, the cities have been far from neglected, in the distribution of our limited Federal resources. Their need is great, but it is not the only need that must be satisfied.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be shown at this point a partial list of Federal funds currently provided to help solve the problems of our great urban areas.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A PARTIAL LIST OF FEDERAL FUNDS FOR URBAN RENEWAL

a. \$2 billion of undisbursed urban renewal appropriations are now on hand in H.U.D.

b. A total of over \$10 billions have been made available to date thru the current fiscal year.

c. Urban renewal is only one program of many for cities: A partial list of other programs:

(1) \$757 million for model cities is in a bill passed last April.

(2) \$291 million has been appropriated this year on metropolitan development.

(3) \$654 million has been included to pay 1 year subsidy on 900,000 public housing units, which we are obliged to subsidize for 40 years, at a total cost of about 35 billion dollars.

(4) \$170 million is provided in new contract act authority for additional public housing units. Total cash will be \$6.8 billion over 40 years.

(5) \$50 million in rent supplement contract authority has been voted this year. This also will have to be multiplied by 40 because that is the duration of the program. Even if we stopped right now and made no additional contracts, the cost would total \$6.8 billion.

(6) \$130 million was granted this year for home ownership assistance. This is a 30-year program which has a total potential obligation of about \$3.9 billion.

(7) \$135 million is provided this year for rental assistance program, for low income people.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, these facts should be thoroughly considered before this \$587 million item is approved. The proper forum for such consideration is in committee, not through a floor amendment to supplemental appropriations bill.

But Mr. President, no hearings were held on the item. If they had been held, as I have cited, such facts would do much to dissipate the criticism that Congress is receiving from mayors of large cities and from some of our colleagues in the Congress.

It should be repeated that there is indeed a crisis in the cities.

There is vast, urgent need for much improvement.

But, it is incorrect to imply that we are standing idly by. In fact, we are doing as much as can be done in keeping with other demands for money and with overall national priorities.

Mr. President, a few minutes ago I noted another crisis—the crisis in fiscal affairs. We are in the grip of a long-

range inflationary spiral and no one is affected more than the people in our urban areas.

Our responsibility must go first to achieving fiscal stability of our Nation. If we do not, all our other programs will go for nothing.

If cities believe they are in dire straits now, these only with imagination will be able to envision their plight with a further reduction in the buying power of the already inadequate wages.

Mr. President, the Senate should recede on its amendment calling for an additional \$587 million in urban renewal funds.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HRUSKA. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, first let me make clear that in saying what I do about the outlook of the other body in connection with this bill I am not at all critical of the tremendous amount of things and work which the rural areas of our country need. What I had in mind was a certain failure to realize the enormous population growth of the cities, the vast problems they have, and the need for a constructive approach. With many, many things needed in the rural areas I was indulging more in parochial thinking rather than seeking to reduce one and increase the other.

On the question of the shortage of summer jobs I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD a newspaper article which was published in the New York Times of yesterday entitled "Shortage of Summer Jobs Found Severest in Years."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHORTAGE OF SUMMER JOBS FOUND SEVEREST IN YEARS

(By John Herbers)

WASHINGTON, June 27.—The slowdown in the economy and rising unemployment among adults has resulted in the severe shortage in summer jobs for youth that the nation has experienced in several years.

Employment officials in 14 representative cities across the country report that the de-

mand is up sharply from last year but that the openings are down drastically.

As a result, many thousands of teen-agers and college students who want to work have been unable to find jobs, significant numbers are taking employment previously scorned as too menial or low-paying and there are frequent reports of students being unable to earn college tuition fees needed for next fall.

In some cities there are indications that some employers are not offering jobs to youths because, as a Los Angeles official said, they have a "misconception that our youth would rather riot and loaf."

Forecasts of idle youth this summer have concerned Government officials for some time. In April, when the Bureau of Labor Statistics reported that 3.7 million persons aged 16 to 21 would enter the labor force between April and July, business executives, placement officials and Government observers predicted that hundreds of thousands of young people might find jobs unavailable.

The prospects of having many thousands of additional teen-agers idle in July and August has aroused official concern about the possibility of violence in the cities. Congress, prodded by the Nixon Administration, voted this week to appropriate \$50 million extra for the hiring of more than 100,000 persons between the ages of 14 and 31 in the Neighborhood Youth Corps. But this is not sufficient to take up the slack.

Meanwhile, a report just issued by the Labor Department on job prospects in the next 10 years says that, while training requirements are rising, eight out of 10 jobs—but not the preferred ones—will be open to young workers with less than a college degree. [Details on Page 56.]

WORSENE PROSPECTS SEEN

Over the years, a number of state, Federal and local agencies, both public and private, have been helping youths find summer jobs. Almost all of these report worsened prospects this year.

"The situation for summer employment this year is quite serious and potentially dangerous," said Alex Altheim, superintendent for youth services for the State Employment Services in New York City.

In Dallas, Richard Moynihan, coordinator of summer programs for the Texas Employment Commission, said that 9,000 of 15,000 applicants in the Dallas area were placed in jobs last year.

"We believe less than 50 per cent of the jobs available in 1969 are available this year," he said, citing a general cutback by private industry.

"We're extremely pessimistic," said Mrs. Jane Dawson of the Los Angeles Economic and Youth Opportunities Agency. "With the fathers out of work, who's going to hire the sons?"

The change from last year, when the teenage employment picture was far from perfect, was illustrated by an incident in Chicago. Jack M. Springer, district manager for Real Silk Inc., which sells hosiery door to door, said he ran small advertisements as usual, seeking salesmen.

"The calls poured in, mostly from college students," he said. "So far we've had more than 200 calls. That's 10 times as many as we were getting last year. Many said they can't find jobs."

Previously, he said, most college students rejected such work, preferring salaried jobs.

"Now economic conditions seem to be forcing many to go into selling, and in my book this could be the best thing that ever happened to them," Mr. Springer said.

More often than not the job shortage results in lower-paying employment. Mrs. Sylvia Blumenfeld, supervisor of the Pennsylvania Employment service in Pittsburgh, pointed to four boxes in her office and said:

"They're filled with about 800 applications. We have some jobs at \$1.60 and \$1.75 an hour.

Last year, they'd look at you like you were crazy if you offered those jobs. Now they'll take jobs for \$1.75, but there are only a few available."

In some cities, the younger teen-agers, who get some of the jobs last year, are finding nothing this year. In Washington, 14-year-olds and 15-year-olds are being discouraged from registering, and 16-year-olds are taking low-paying jobs they had previously shunned.

William Butler, head of the Mini Job Center for the D.C. Manpower Commission, said he would call a 16-year-old boy about a job that pays very little and say:

"How you doing baby? I want to lay something on you. You're lost man. You're only 16. You're not going to get a job, but I'm really going to work for you, baby. I've got some jobs, see, if you want to try them on."

Mr. Butler is usually successful.

A STEP BACKWARD

"It's toughest for the high school kids," said a spokesman for the Illinois State Employment Service in Chicago, where there has been a 38 per cent decline in listings. "The college kids are stepping down and taking poorer jobs which normally would go to high school students. I know of one football player who had a good construction job last year, and now he's working as a busboy at low pay."

For many youths, the job search began last winter and is still continuing. Phil Had-dix, a 21-year-old Negro from Milwaukee who will be a senior at the University of Minnesota in the fall, made \$1,700 last summer in a Milwaukee factory. He said he had been unable to find any job this summer and that, if he did not find employment soon, he would begin looking in other cities.

In Atlanta, Pamela Heard, a 18-year-old Negro, said: "I've been looking for about two weeks. I just graduated from high school, and I want to go to Howard University in Washington." The lack of a job she said, may prevent her from going to college.

Most of the public jobs and those being arranged by the National Alliance of Businessmen, a voluntary group working with the Government and using Federal money first go to the disadvantaged. But the inner-city poor are reported to be suffering, nevertheless, because their families are hurt by the economic slowdown and because many of the jobs are in the suburbs and there is not adequate transportation to get the youngsters there.

"Kids in the city, and particularly blacks, are hardest hit," said John Coulter, manpower director for the Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry. "Some black families suffer the double consequences of the father laid off, and sons and daughters unable to get summer work."

In Houston, Keith Turkington, director of a special private program that is trying to place youths in jobs, said: "Some companies just don't want to cooperate on summer job programs, and use the economy as an excuse." In Los Angeles, Don Pool, a state employment official, said that some employers appeared to be afraid of long hair and beards and generally had a "stereotyped feeling" about youths.

There are some exceptions. In Newark, the National Alliance for Businessmen has doubled from last year the number of job openings it will fill—from 1,100 to 2,200. The reason, an official explained, is that a federally subsidized transportation system will take inner-city youth to jobs out to the suburbs, where the pay is about \$2 an hour.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, if it were not absolutely essential to pass this bill today, I would be fighting it and seeking to send it back to conference to include the other \$50 million the Senate voted. We are in a shortfall of almost a million summer jobs, which the Government

should contribute. It is a shocking situation and it may cause us very great difficulty.

I extend great credit to the distinguished Senator from West Virginia (Mr. BYRD), the President, and former Secretary of Labor Shultz. However, we are still dreadfully short; there is a tremendous shortfall in the Government sector. I share the concern of the Postmaster General, which has been expressed recently.

In connection with the Manpower Training Act which we are now marking up in the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I expect to include an amendment which would require a much earlier report in each calendar year as to summer jobs. I intend also in the coming week to explore with the President's Council on Youth Opportunity what might be done to make the executive branch and the Congress more responsive to these needs.

We now find ourselves panting after the event. Here we are in the last days of June and we expect that on July 1 this money is going to be made available and intelligently allocated for summer jobs.

I regret very much what has been done. There is no other course, but it cannot go unchallenged, unprotested, or unnoticed, and I hope we can do better because of amendments to the law.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HRUSKA. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Nebraska. I would like to make two or three points.

Of course, I think the Senator from New York is entirely correct in his assessment of the bad situation for summer jobs. I also am concerned about it. Second, I would like to say that unfortunately in Congress we have had in the last few years a tendency on the part of legislative committees to insert authorizations in bills which in their minds were the ceiling of what Congress should do, and we have had extended arguments that the ceilings set by the authorization committees become, therefore, obligatory upon the Committee on Appropriations. I do not so regard it. I regard the duty of the Committee on Appropriations to insert under those ceilings, which are admittedly always maximum ceilings, to offer to the Senate, and suggest to the Senate in bills, the amount they think after very extended hearings—and they are always afforded extended hearings—is justified, taking into consideration first the need and second the budget requirement.

We are seeing this year an attempt to load very heavy appropriation bills extremely far over the budget. Our fiscal policies are somewhat like a man in a home who has to decide whether or not to buy Johnny a new pair of shoes or Suzie a new dress. We have to decide on priorities in the Senate and priorities in Congress; and if we permit everything to just balloon above the target, we are going to set in motion again a cycle of inflation which, in turn, will defeat the very things we are trying to do be-

cause these inflationary items go into urban renewal and everything we do.

I would like to make one final statement. I would like to pay tribute to the distinguished Senator from West Virginia, the chairman of the subcommittee, and to the distinguished Senator from Nebraska. We upheld the Senate position. The Senator from Rhode Island was very eloquent. However, the House has assumed the responsibility of saying, "We cannot go this far above the budget or we will destroy the things we are trying to do to whip inflation."

I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I am prepared to yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the able Senator from New York (Mr. JAVRS) anent the neighborhood youth summer jobs. The Senator made a very convincing case before the subcommittee. It was he who first called attention to the great need for appropriations in this respect. I can appreciate his feelings as he has expressed them today. I think the conferees did the best it could with the conference. The conferees did all they could. The House felt very strongly the amount should not be over the budget estimate. I feel we have achieved some good in that we appropriated \$50 million, which was the budget estimate.

I wish to thank the Senate conferees and particularly the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. HRUSKA). I have expressed my gratitude to the conferees on both sides of the aisle who worked with me in conference and supported me there so well.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McGOVERN). The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendments in disagreement.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House agree to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 17399) entitled "An Act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes."

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 12, 20, 22, 24, 51, and 62 to the aforesaid bill, and concur therein.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2 to the aforesaid bill, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the date "September 30" named in said amendment, insert: *October 31*

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10 to the aforesaid bill, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum named in said amendment, insert: *\$318,000*

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15 to the aforesaid bill, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum named in said amendment, insert: *\$350,000*

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 50, to the aforesaid bill, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the bill number S. 2694 named in said amendment, insert: *H.R. 17138*

Resolved, That the House insist on its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 13 and 16 to the aforesaid bill.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I move, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 10, 15, and 50.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from West Virginia.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I move that the Senate recede on amendment No. 13.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from West Virginia.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I move that the Senate recede on amendment No. 16.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from West Virginia.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the conference report was agreed to.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I move that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF THE FOREIGN MILITARY SALES ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from Alabama (Mr. ALLEN) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, on tomorrow the Senate will conclude action on the Foreign Military Sales Act at 4 o'clock. At 2 o'clock the vote will be taken on the committee amendment which embraces as a part thereof the Cooper-Church amendment. I have opposed the Cooper-Church amendment and will vote against it on tomorrow.

Today, at 1 o'clock, a vote will be taken on the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Colorado (Mr. ALLOTT). The time will be controlled starting at 12 o'clock, leaving 30 minutes to the side. Rather than seek to obtain some of the time allotted to the two sides at that time, the junior Senator from Alabama has chosen to speak during the period set aside for the transaction of routine morning business.

Mr. President, there is no monopoly, of course, upon the use of words in an amendment. There is no monopoly on the use of an idea. Of course, the Allott amendment is the amendment by the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. McGOVERN) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. HATFIELD), the McGovern-Hatfield amendment. This amendment has been called the end the war amendment. And whereas the Cooper-Church amendment is applicable only to the situation, pres-

ent and future, in Cambodia, the McGovern-Hatfield amendment and the Allott amendment seek to cover the whole range of the war in Southeast Asia, providing for the withdrawal of all support of military operations on the part of American troops in Cambodia 30 days after the final passage of the amendment or the act embracing the amendment.

Then, as to Vietnam and Laos, it calls for withdrawal of the support on December 31 of this year, except for the fact that a 6-month period, on through June 30, 1971, would be set aside for the support of the actual withdrawal of American troops from Vietnam.

I oppose the Allott amendment. I will oppose, if it comes up, the McGovern-Hatfield amendment, because I believe it is even worse than the Cooper-Church amendment, because it not only sets a definite timetable on withdrawal of the support for our troops in Cambodia, Laos, and Vietnam, but also sets the time when all of our troops must have been withdrawn from Southeast Asia.

The Allott amendment actually is the McGovern-Hatfield amendment in masquerade. So it is the position of the junior Senator from Alabama, opposing as he does the provisions of the McGovern-Hatfield amendment as well as the Allott amendment, that whenever an opportunity comes to vote against such an amendment, either on a direct vote or on a motion to table, the junior Senator from Alabama is going to avail himself of that opportunity.

Now it seems that the strategy that is to be employed at 1 o'clock is that a motion to table the Allott amendment is to be made by the proponents, the sponsors, of the McGovern-Hatfield amendment, even though the amendments are identical. So we have the paradoxical condition coming at 1 o'clock of those who support the language of the Allott amendment—which is identical to the McGovern-Hatfield amendment—saying, "Let us table it in order to save it," which seems to the junior Senator from Alabama as a strange position to take. Then the supporters of the Allott amendment are taking the position, "Let us not table it in order to kill it." But there is actually a third position, which the junior Senator from Alabama adopts, and that is to table the Allott amendment in order to kill it, because that will effectively kill the amendment if the vote to table should carry.

The junior Senator from Alabama is impressed also with the fact that the language in the McGovern-Hatfield amendment was first proposed, or was first suggested, by the distinguished Senator from South Dakota and the distinguished Senator from Oregon. It is well known that it was their amendment, that they were going to offer it at a time to be chosen by them. So it would occur to the junior Senator from Alabama that it would only be fair play to allow them to offer that amendment at such time as they may see fit.

But that is not the impelling reason that causes the junior Senator from Alabama to announce his intention of voting to table the Allott amendment. The Allott amendment and the McGovern-Hatfield amendment provide the

very same thing. They would show lack of support of the President in his position in Southeast Asia, and the setting of a timetable for complete withdrawal of American forces from Vietnam and the other areas in Southeast Asia, and the actual withdrawal of support from our soldiers in Southeast Asia, according to a definite timetable.

As far as the junior Senator from Alabama has been able to ascertain, the consideration of the Cooper-Church amendment and the McGovern-Hatfield amendment and the Allott amendment is the only time when the Congress has seriously considered the matter of withdrawing support from American troops when they are in the actual heat of battle on a mission on which they had been dispatched by the President of the United States. To withdraw support from them under these conditions is unthinkable.

So the position of the junior Senator from Alabama is that we must not withdraw support from the American troops, wherever they are. And since the McGovern-Hatfield amendment would do that, and since the Allott amendment, which has sought to take over, for the purpose of killing it, the McGovern-Hatfield amendment, would do that, the junior Senator from Alabama must oppose either of these amendments whenever he gets the opportunity to do so.

So when the motion to table is made with respect to the Allott amendment, the junior Senator from Alabama, opposing the amendment, will vote to table it. He will vote that way against the Allott amendment or against the McGovern-Hatfield amendment, irrespective of which it might be. He does not follow the theory that the best way to kill an amendment is to vote not to table it. If we have an opportunity to table something, let us table it and use the votes of those who support the amendment and are taking the position, "Let us table it so we can save it." Let us use those votes also to carry the motion to table, thereby defeating the amendment.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

WELFARE REFORM

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, reform of our welfare system is one of the most important matters before the Congress today.

The present system should be changed. It is too costly, and it is not fair either to taxpayers or to the recipients of welfare. It is outdated. It needs to be modernized.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has proposed a new family assistance plan, which it claims will solve our welfare problems.

The original version of this proposal was approved by the House of Repre-

sentatives and was then submitted to the Senate Finance Committee, of which I am a member. During the committee's hearings, the following facts were established:

First. The proposal, for the first time, would establish the principle of a guaranteed annual wage. HEW Secretary Robert Finch suggested \$1,600; the National Welfare Rights Organization demands \$5,500.

Second. Mr. Finch admitted the cost of his program would be nearly double the cost of the present system—and evidence indicates that his estimates for the new proposal are low, being based on 1968 figures.

Third. The selling point in the Finch program is the so-called work incentive feature. But there is doubt that this incentive will work.

For example, a worker earning \$9,000 with a family of four has a take-home pay of \$7,615. But under the original proposal, in New York, he could quit work and receive the same amount from welfare programs, in cash and other public benefits.

Fourth. Under questioning by me, Secretary Finch admitted his proposal would increase the welfare rolls from 10 million to 24 million. I then asked him this question, to which I received no satisfactory reply: "How can we reverse the trend toward the welfare state by increasing the welfare rolls from 10 million persons to 24 million persons?"

Fifth. Governor Reagan of California wrote to me that 8 percent of his State's population now on welfare would go to 14 percent under the Finch proposal.

I concluded that I could not support the Finch proposal in its original form. I worked with Finance Committee colleagues to have it sent back to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to be completely reworked.

The HEW Department now has presented a revised proposal for reforming the welfare system, which it claims will overcome the objections to the original plan. I am keeping an open mind toward the new scheme until hearings are held by the Finance Committee to examine it in detail.

During the time that hearings were in progress on the original proposal, the Virginia State Chamber of Commerce sent to me a copy of a proposed resolution suggesting that the welfare programs operated by the Federal Government be subjected to a study by a Presidential Commission, on the order of the Hoover Commission.

I immediately determined that this was a sound proposal, and I submitted Senate Joint Resolution 205 to establish a study commission on welfare. The resolution calls on the commission to study the Federal welfare system and make recommendations for modernizing it in an equitable way.

If the new version of the administration welfare bill is satisfactory, I shall not press my resolution. But if it is not—and I have grave doubts on this score—then my resolution would insure that the welfare system does not just remain on dead center. Constructive action can be undertaken at once.

I feel that we have a deep obligation

to those who are physically or mentally unable to earn a living. I do not feel, however, that Congress should turn over tax funds of hard-working citizens to able-bodied persons who refuse to work.

It is important that the present welfare program be reformed, but we must be sure we get something better.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of a resolution submitted by the National Affairs Committee of the Virginia State Chamber of Commerce, concerning the Federal welfare program, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A RESOLUTION SUBMITTED BY THE NATIONAL AFFAIRS COMMITTEE OF THE VIRGINIA STATE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Whereas, the federal welfare program has expanded haphazardly and without common direction for 40 years, and

Whereas, the constant addition and multiplication of welfare plans has resulted in an unwieldy, duplication system that too often encourages a caste system of idleness and unproductivity and discourages incentive and self-help among those it is designed to help, and

Whereas, the major portion of the increasing tax burden to support these many welfare programs must be borne by the productive workers in the lower and middle income brackets,

Be it hereby resolved that the Virginia State Chamber of Commerce calls on the national Administration to create a study group composed of outstanding citizens similar to the Presidential Commission on the Reorganization and Management of the Executive Branch (commonly called the Hoover Commission) for the purpose of streamlining and reorganizing our present federal welfare programs and setting forth a sensible and realistic pattern which can provide guidance to revisions dictated by future circumstances, and

Be it further resolved that copies of this resolution be transmitted to all state Chambers of Commerce throughout the United States with a request for similar endorsement so that a national expression of concern can be conveyed to the national Administration and to our elected representatives.

Approved by the National Affairs Committee in session at the Marriott Twin-Bridges Motor Hotel, April 27, 1970.

Adopted by the Board of Directors in session at the Chamberlin Hotel, May 7, 1970.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, is there further morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

AMENDMENT OF THE FOREIGN MILITARY SALES ACT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 15628) to amend the Foreign Military Sales Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MANSFIELD). Without objection, it is so ordered.

APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE REPORT—OBJECTION

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask for 30 seconds from someone.

Mr. CHURCH. I yield 30 seconds to the Senator from Florida.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida is recognized.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, for the Senate Committee on Appropriations, I send forward the committee report, which is unanimous, on H.R. 17923, an act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for fiscal year 1971—

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I have to call attention to the fact that this would be morning business, that the unfinished business has already been laid down and therefore this would be in violation of the Pastore rule on germaneness.

Mr. HOLLAND. It has already been done.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I interrupted the Senator before he submitted his report.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I withhold the report, Mr. President.

AMENDMENT OF THE FOREIGN MILITARY SALES ACT

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill (H.R. 15628) to amend the Foreign Military Sales Act.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MANSFIELD). The Senator from Colorado will state it.

Mr. ALLOTT. Do I correctly understand that I have 30 minutes available to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct. How much time does the Senator yield himself?

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I require.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado is recognized.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, last Thursday I introduced an amendment, No. 741, which, if passed, would unconstitutionally infringe upon the powers of the Commander in Chief, and would cut the ground from under any remaining hopes we have for meaningful negotiations to end the violence in Southeast Asia.

This amendment has the same wording as the so-called amendment to end the war—the McGovern-Hatfield amendment. I have proposed this amendment—in full accord with the rules and precedents of the U.S. Senate—in order that we could resolve finally the division that hangs over the country, the Senate and the President.

The day before I introduced the amendment, the junior Senator from South Dakota, who frequently advises Americans of their moral duty to stand up and be counted, announced that he would move to table such an amendment so that he could introduce it at a later date. He did not dwell on his reasons for strenuously opposing an attempt to allow the Senate to stand up and be counted on this matter.

Mr. President, let us not mince words. We are nearing the end of a thorough debate on our policy in Asia, and on policymaking procedures. I know of no Senator who does not feel that all members have had ample opportunity to make their views known. In addition, supporters of this amendment have been generating support for it for the past 59 days. In these circumstances, a vote to table this amendment will be a vote to duck the issue, a vote to avoid putting one's convictions on the line.

A motion to table will be very hard to fathom, especially if it is supported by those Senators whose adoration of the amendment is so intense that they have urged the public to invest nearly half a million dollars in a promotional campaign on its behalf. And it will be doubly hard to fathom if the original proponents of this amendment support tabling. Nearly 2 months ago they indicated that an up-or-down vote such as this is long overdue; and nearly 2 months ago they indicated that they expected and would be ready to vote in 1 month.

Should this amendment not be allowed to come to a final passage today, it will not be because of a split between hawks and doves. Rather, it will be because of a conscious decision by the majority party in this body.

I hope that will not happen. I hope that all of us, regardless of our beliefs about the proper final disposition of this amendment, will respect the American people's strong desire to have prompt action on it. It is my very clear impression that this desire is widely shared, and is most strong among those who support the amendment. I cannot in good conscience support the amendment. But I can—and, in good conscience, must—accede to the request for prompt Senate consideration of it.

Throughout the country, supporters of the amendment want a vote on it. They do not want mere procedural considerations to prevent prompt action.

Although we start from very different presuppositions, and although our reasoning is entirely different, proponents of the amendment and I come to one conclusion together: Lives may be saved by the prompt consideration of this measure. When human lives may be saved—as I believe they will be by the prompt defeat of this measure—we cannot utilize a motion to table the amendment as a pretext for avoiding the issue on the amendment.

I know that some of my most respected colleagues have procedural reasons for being reluctant to bring this matter to a final vote. To them I urgently and respectfully commend several considerations. One of these I need only restate. Prompt final action on this measure may save human lives.

Two other considerations are these. First, the proponents of the pending amendment are on record as favoring and expecting a vote at about this time. Second, the only reason for not voting now is to allow time for the science of merchandizing to get mixed up with the art of legislating. Let me explain these two points.

On May 2, Senators McGOVERN, HATFIELD, HUGHES, and GOODALL held a press conference at which they announced their intention to submit an amendment with the same wording as the pending amendment. In their joint statement of more than 8 weeks ago these Senators said that "the time has come for Congress to face a historic constitutional choice." I agree, I think the time has come for Congress, and especially those who support the so-called amendment to end the war to allow this amendment to come to vote.

On May 7, 54 days ago, the distinguished junior Senator from South Dakota said that his amendment would come to a vote "in approximately 30 days." In this speech in the Senate, he declared:

No longer will we just make speeches lecturing the President on what we think we should do.

At that time the Senator seemed very anxious to vote.

In the same speech he said:

Instead of wringing our hands, or tearing our hair, or throwing bricks, or blocking traffic, let us go to work on our Congress and Senators and our neighbors and friends and make constitutional government serve our needs.

We agree on one point. When he spoke 54 days ago he indicated that 30 days would be adequate for proponents of this amendment to rally their support and participate in the debate we have been having. I think he was right.

A full page advertisement in the New York Times of May 24 asked for money to support the drive to pass the so-called amendment to end the war. A huge headline on the advertisement assured contributors that the amendment would come to a vote by July 1. Today the supporters of that money-raising advertisement have their last chance to make their advertisement accurate.

They can do this by allowing the amendment to come to a final vote.

Mr. President, I do not know if the press has been correct in reporting that

Calendar No. 918

91ST CONGRESS
2^D SESSION

H. R. 17399

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

JUNE 11 (legislative day, JUNE 10), 1970

Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

AMENDMENT

Intended to be proposed by Mr. MONDALE (for himself, Mr. CASE, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. JAVITS, and Mr. PELL) to H.R. 17399, an Act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes, viz:

- 1 On page 15, line 2, insert before the period a colon and
- 2 the following: "*Provided further*, That no part of the funds
- 3 contained in this appropriation shall be used to assist a school
- 4 district which engages, or within the 1969-1970 school year
- 5 has engaged, in the gift, lease, or sale of real or personal
- 6 property, or services, to a nonpublic elementary or secondary
- 7 school or school system practicing discrimination on the basis
- 8 of race, color, or national origin".

Amdt. No. 690

Amdt. No. 690

Calendar No. 918

**91ST CONGRESS
2D SESSION**

H. R. 17399

AMENDMENT

Intended to be proposed by Mr. MONDALE (for himself, Mr. CASE, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. PELL) to H.R. 17399, an Act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes.

JUNE 11 (legislative day, JUNE 10), 1970

Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

Calendar No. 918

91ST CONGRESS
2^D SESSION

H. R. 17399

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

JUNE 11 (legislative day, JUNE 10), 1970

Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

AMENDMENT

Intended to be proposed by Mr. MONDALE (for himself, Mr. CASE, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. JAVITS) to H.R. 17399, an Act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes, viz:

1 On page 15, line 2, insert before the period a colon and
2 the following: "*Provided further*, That no part of the funds
3 contained in this appropriation shall be used to supplant funds
4 which, in the absence of funds under this section, or in the
5 absence of desegregation, would be made available from
6 non-Federal sources for the education of pupils in a recipient
7 school district".

Amdt. No. 691

H. R. 17399

AMENDMENT

Intended to be proposed by Mr. MONDALE (for himself, Mr. CASE, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. JAVITS) to H.R. 17399, an Act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes.

JUNE 11 (legislative day, JUNE 10), 1970

Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

Calendar No. 918

91ST CONGRESS
2^D SESSION

H. R. 17399

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

JUNE 11 (legislative day, JUNE 10), 1970

Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

AMENDMENT

Intended to be proposed by Mr. MONDALE (for himself, Mr. CASE, Mr. JAVITS, and Mr. KENNEDY) to H.R. 17399, an Act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes, viz:

- 1 On page 15, line 2, insert before the period a colon and
- 2 the following: "*Provided further*, That no part of the funds
- 3 contained in this appropriation shall be denied to any school
- 4 district legally required to desegregate schools on the basis
- 5 of the location of the school district or the source of the legal
- 6 requirement".

Amdt. No. 692

AMENDMENT

Intended to be proposed by Mr. MONDALE (for himself, Mr. CASE, Mr. JAVITS, and Mr. KENNEDY) to H.R. 17399, an Act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes.

JUNE 11 (legislative day, JUNE 10), 1970

Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

Calendar No. 918

91ST CONGRESS
2^D SESSION

H. R. 17399

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

JUNE 11 (legislative day, JUNE 10), 1970

Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

AMENDMENT

Intended to be proposed by Mr. JAVITS (for himself, Mr. BAYH, Mr. BROOKE, Mr. CRANSTON, Mr. GOODELL, Mr. HART, Mr. HATFIELD, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MONDALE, Mr. MUSKIE, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PACKWOOD, Mr. PELL, Mr. SCOTT, and Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey) to H.R. 17399, an Act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes, viz:

- 1 On page 12, line 8, strike out "\$50,000,000" and insert
- 2 in lieu thereof "\$115,000,000".

Amdt. No. 693

AMENDMENT

Intended to be proposed by Mr. JAVITS (for himself, Mr. BAYH, Mr. BROOKE, Mr. CRANSTON, Mr. GODELL, Mr. HART, Mr. HATFIELD, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MONDALE, Mr. MUSKIE, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PACKWOOD, Mr. PELL, Mr. SCOTT, and Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey) to H.R. 17399, an Act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes.

JUNE 11 (legislative day, JUNE 10), 1970

Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

Calendar No. 918

91ST CONGRESS
2^D SESSION

H. R. 17399

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

JUNE 12, 1970

Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

AMENDMENT

Intended to be proposed by Mr. JAVITS (for himself, Mr. BAYH, Mr. BROOKE, Mr. CRANSTON, Mr. GOODELL, Mr. HART, Mr. HATFIELD, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MONDALE, Mr. MUSKIE, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PACKWOOD, Mr. PELL, Mr. SCOTT, and Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey) to H.R. 17399, an Act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes, viz: On page 8, between lines 5 and 6, insert the following:

1 ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY PROGRAM

2 For an additional amount for work and training pro-
3 grams to carry out the provisions of part B of title I of the
4 Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, as amended, \$65,-

Amdt. No. 695

- 1 000,000, to remain available until September 30, 1970:
 2 *Provided*, That this appropriation shall not be available
 3 for the purposes of section 102 (b) and 130 of said Act.

Amdt. No. 695

Calendar No. 918

91ST CONGRESS
2D SESSION**H. R. 17399****AMENDMENT**

Intended to be proposed by Mr. JAVITS (for himself, Mr. BAYH, Mr. BROOKE, Mr. CRANSTON, Mr. GOODELL, Mr. HART, Mr. HATFIELD, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MONDALE, Mr. MUSKIE, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PACKWOOD, Mr. PELL, Mr. SCOTT, and Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey) to H.R. 17399, an Act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes.

JUNE 12, 1970

Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

Calendar No. 918

91ST CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. R. 17399

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

JUNE 15, 1970

Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

AMENDMENT

Intended to be proposed by Mr. JAVITS (for himself, Mr. BAYH, Mr. BROOKE, Mr. CRANSTON, Mr. GOODELL, Mr. HART, Mr. HATFIELD, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MONDALE, Mr. MUSKIE, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PACKWOOD, Mr. PELL, Mr. SCOTT, and Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey) to H.R. 17399, an Act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes, viz:

- 1 On page 12, line 8, strike out "\$50,000,000" and insert
- 2 in lieu thereof "\$100,000,000".

Amdt. No. 699

Amdt. No. 699

Calendar No. 918

**91ST CONGRESS
2D Session**

H. R. 17399

AMENDMENT

Intended to be proposed by Mr. JAVITS (for himself, Mr. BAYH, Mr. BROOKE, Mr. CRANSTON, Mr. GOODELL, Mr. HART, Mr. HATFIELD, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MONDALE, Mr. MUSKIE, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PACKWOOD, Mr. PELL, Mr. SCOTT, and Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey) to H.R. 17399, an Act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes.

JUNE 15, 1970

Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

Calendar No. 918

91ST CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. R. 17399

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

JUNE 16, 1970

Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

AMENDMENT

Intended to be proposed by Mr. MONDALE (for himself, Mr. CASE, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. MUSKIE, Mr. PELL, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. BAYH, and Mr. BROOKE) to H.R. 17399, an Act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes, viz:

1 On page 15, line 2, insert before the period a colon and
2 the following: "*Provided further*, That no part of the funds
3 contained in this appropriation shall be used to assist a school
4 district which, subsequent to the beginning of the 1969-1970
5 school year, has engaged in the gift, lease, or sale of real or
6 personal property, or services, to a nonpublic elementary or
7 secondary school or school system practicing discrimination
8 on the basis of race, color, or national origin."

Amdt. No. 702

Amdt. No. 702

Calendar No. 918

91ST CONGRESS
2d Session

H. R. 17399

AMENDMENT

Intended to be proposed by Mr. MONDALE (for himself, Mr. CASE, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. MUSKIE, Mr. PELL, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. BAYH, and Mr. BROOKE) to H.R. 17399, an Act, making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes.

JUNE 16, 1970

Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

Calendar No. 918

91ST CONGRESS
2^D SESSION

H. R. 17399

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

JUNE 16, 1970

Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

AMENDMENT

Intended to be proposed by Mr. MONDALE (for himself, Mr. CASE, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. MUSKIE, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. BAYH, and Mr. BROOKE) to H.R. 17399, an Act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes, viz:

- 1 On page 15, line 2, insert before the period a colon
- 2 and the following: "*Provided further*, That no part of the
- 3 funds contained in this appropriation shall be used to sup-
- 4 plant funding from non-Federal sources, which has been
- 5 reduced as the result of desegregation or the availability
- 6 of funding under this section."

Amdt. No. 703

AMENDMENT

Intended to be proposed by Mr. MONDALE (for himself, Mr. CASE, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. MUSKIE, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. BAYH, and Mr. BROOKE) to H.R. 17399, an Act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes.

JUNE 16, 1970

Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

Calendar No. 918

91ST CONGRESS
2^D SESSION

H. R. 17399

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

JUNE 16, 1970

Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

AMENDMENT

Intended to be proposed by Mr. MONDALE (for himself, and Mr. CASE, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. MUSKIE, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. BAYH and Mr. BROOKE) to H.R. 17399, an Act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes, viz:

1 On page 15, line 2, insert before the period a colon and
2 the following: "*Provided further*, That no part of the funds
3 contained in this appropriation shall be made available to
4 carry out any program or activity under any policy, pro-
5 cedure, or practice denying funds to any school district legally
6 required to desegregate schools, on the basis of geography or
7 the source of the legal requirement."

Amdt. No. 704

AMENDMENT

Intended to be proposed by Mr. MONDALE (for himself, Mr. CASE, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. MUSKIE, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. BAYH, and Mr. BROOKE) to H.R. 17399, an Act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes.

JUNE 16, 1970

Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed



Public Law 91-305
91st Congress, H. R. 17399
July 6, 1970

An Act

84 STAT. 376

Making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to supply supplemental appropriations (this Act may be cited as the "Second Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1970") for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes, namely:

Second Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1970.

TITLE I

CHAPTER I

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

EXTENSION SERVICE

COOPERATIVE EXTENSION WORK, PAYMENTS, AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Cooperative extension work, payments and expenses" for "Retirement and employees' compensation costs for extension agents", not to exceed \$425,000 to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Payments to States and Puerto Rico", fiscal year 1970.

FOOD AND NUTRITION SERVICE

FOOD STAMP PROGRAM

For necessary expenses of the Food Stamp Program pursuant to the Food Stamp Act of 1964, as amended, for the period July 1, 1970, to October 31, 1970, \$300,000,000, to be charged to the amount appropriated under this head in H.R. 17923, when enacted.

78 Stat. 703,
7 USC 2011 note.

CHAPTER II

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—MILITARY

RETIRED MILITARY PERSONNEL

RETIRED PAY, DEFENSE

For an additional amount for "Retired pay, Defense," \$99,000,000.

CHAPTER III

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

FEDERAL FUNDS

FEDERAL PAYMENT TO DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

For an additional amount for "Federal payment to the District of Columbia", to be paid to the general fund of the District of Columbia, \$3,997,000.

LOANS TO THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FOR CAPITAL OUTLAY

For an additional amount for "Loans to the District of Columbia for capital outlay", \$1,293,000, to remain available until expended and to be advanced to the general fund upon request of the Commissioner.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FUNDS

GENERAL OPERATING EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "General operating expenses", \$129,675.

PUBLIC SAFETY

For an additional amount for "Public safety", including purchase of sixty passenger motor vehicles for police-type use which may exceed the general purchase price limitation for the current fiscal year by not in excess of \$400 per vehicle, \$3,966,485.

The limitation on the expenditure of funds by the Chief of Police for prevention and detection of crime during the current fiscal year shall be \$100,000.

PARKS AND RECREATION

For an additional amount for "Parks and recreation", \$171,750

SETTLEMENT OF CLAIMS AND SUITS

For payment of property damage claims in excess of \$500 and of personal injury claims in excess of \$1,000, approved by the Commissioner in accordance with the provisions of the Act of February 11, 1929, as amended (45 Stat. 1160; 46 Stat. 500; 65 Stat. 131), \$20,000, payable from the general fund.

D. C. Code
1-902 to
1-906.

CAPITAL OUTLAY

For an additional amount for "Capital outlay", to remain available until expended, \$8,048,000: *Provided*, That \$318,000 shall be available for construction services by the Director of General Services or by contract for architectural engineering services, as may be determined by the Commissioner.

DIVISION OF EXPENSES

The sums appropriated herein for the District of Columbia shall be paid out of the general fund of the District of Columbia, except as otherwise specifically provided.

CHAPTER IV

FOREIGN OPERATIONS

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL INSTITUTION

INVESTMENT IN INTER-AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK

For an additional amount for subscription to the Inter-American Development Bank, to remain available until expended, \$205,880,000, for the second of two installments of the United States share in the authorized increase in callable capital stock of the Bank.

CHAPTER V

INDEPENDENT OFFICES

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

FEDERAL LABOR RELATIONS COUNCIL

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

The limitation heretofore provided on the rate of compensation for the public members of the Federal Service Impasses Panel is increased to a rate of not to exceed the per diem rate equivalent to the rate for grade GS-18.

35 F. R. 6247.

PAYMENT TO CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY FUND

For an additional amount for "Payment to civil service retirement and disability fund", as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 8348, \$157,816,600, to be credited to the civil service retirement and disability fund.

80 Stat. 584;
83 Stat. 137.

COMMISSION ON POPULATION GROWTH AND THE AMERICAN FUTURE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the Commission on Population Growth and the American Future, including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, and hire of passenger motor vehicles, \$965,000, to remain available until expended.

80 Stat. 416.

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

REAL PROPERTY ACTIVITIES

SITES AND EXPENSES, PUBLIC BUILDINGS PROJECTS

For an additional amount for "Sites and expenses, public buildings projects", \$371,000, to remain available until expended.

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", \$7,000,000.

VETERANS ADMINISTRATION

COMPENSATION AND PENSIONS

For an additional amount for "Compensation and pensions", \$273,045,000, to remain available until expended.

READJUSTMENT BENEFITS

For an additional amount for "Readjustment benefits", \$327,500,000, to remain available until expended.

MEDICAL CARE

For an additional amount for "Medical care", \$113,500,000.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY AND OFFICE OF
ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the Council on Environmental Quality and the Office of Environmental Quality, in carrying out their functions under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (Public Law 91-190) and the Environmental Quality Improvement Act of 1970 (Public Law 91-224), including hire of passenger vehicles, and partial support of the Cabinet Committee on the Environment and the Citizen's Advisory Committee on Environmental Quality, established by Executive Order 11472 of May 29, 1969, as amended by Executive Order 11514 of March 5, 1970, \$350,000.

83 Stat. 852.

42 USC 4321

note.

Ante, p. 114.

16 USC 17k note.

35 F. R. 4247.

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

DISASTER RELIEF

For an additional amount for "Disaster Relief", \$75,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That not to exceed 3 per centum of the foregoing amount shall be available for administrative expenses.

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN
DEVELOPMENT

RENEWAL AND HOUSING ASSISTANCE

LOW RENT PUBLIC HOUSING ANNUAL CONTRIBUTIONS

For an additional amount for "Low-rent public housing annual contributions", fiscal year 1969, \$13,616,000.

COLLEGE HOUSING

The limitation on total payments that may be required in any fiscal year by all contracts for annual grants with educational institutions entered into pursuant to Section 401 of the Housing Act of 1950, as amended (82 Stat. 604), is increased by \$5,000,000.

83 Stat. 390.

12 USC 1749.

MORTGAGE CREDIT

FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

HOMEOWNERSHIP AND RENTAL HOUSING ASSISTANCE

The limitation on total payments that may be required in any fiscal year by all contracts entered into under section 235 of the National Housing Act, as amended (82 Stat. 477), is increased by \$35,000,000, and the limitation on total payments under those entered into under section 236 of such Act (82 Stat. 498), is increased by \$35,000,000.

83 Stat. 53.

12 USC 1715z.

83 Stat. 53.

12 USC 1715z-1.

CHAPTER VI

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT OF LANDS AND RESOURCES

For an additional amount for "Management of lands and resources," \$23,790,000.

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

RESOURCES MANAGEMENT

For an additional amount for "Resources management," \$700,000.

BUREAU OF OUTDOOR RECREATION

LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION

For an additional amount for "Land and Water Conservation," to remain available until expended, \$7,100,000, to be derived from the Land and Water Conservation Fund, and to be available to the National Park Service for property acquisition authorized by the act of September 13, 1962 (Public Law 87-657), as amended.

76 Stat. 538.
16 USC 459c-
459c-7.

OFFICE OF TERRITORIES

ADMINISTRATION OF TERRITORIES

For an additional amount for "Administration of Territories," \$275,000, to remain available until expended.

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

SURVEYS, INVESTIGATIONS, AND RESEARCH

For an additional amount for "Surveys, investigations, and research", \$225,000.

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

MANAGEMENT AND PROTECTION

For an additional amount for "Management and Protection," \$775,000.

RELATED AGENCIES

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

FOREST SERVICE

FOREST PROTECTION AND UTILIZATION

For an additional amount for "Forest protection and utilization," for "Forest land management", \$21,172,000, including \$172,000 to remain available until expended.

NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

In addition to amounts heretofore appropriated under this heading there are appropriated amounts equal to the total amount of gifts, bequests, and devises of money, and other property received by each Endowment, during the current and preceding fiscal years, under the provisions of section 10(a)(2) of the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities Act of 1965, as amended, but not to exceed a total of \$2,000,000, to remain available until expended.

82 Stat. 186.
20 USC 959.

CHAPTER VII

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

MANPOWER ADMINISTRATION

MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING ACTIVITIES

For an additional amount for "Manpower development and training activities", to carry out the provisions of section 102 of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, as amended, \$50,000,000 remain available until September 30, 1970: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall not be available for the purposes of sections 106(d) and 309(b) of said Act.

76 Stat. 24;
79 Stat. 75.
42 USC 2572.
82 Stat. 1352,
1354.
42 USC 2573,
2619.

BUREAU OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEES AND EX-SERVICEMEN

For an additional amount for "Unemployment compensation for Federal employees and ex-servicemen", \$50,000,000.

TRADE ADJUSTMENT ACTIVITIES

For an additional amount for "Trade Adjustment Activities", \$2,330,000, together with such amount as may be necessary to be charged to the subsequent year appropriation for these expenses for any period subsequent to March 31 of the current year.

LIMITATION ON GRANTS TO STATES FOR UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION AND EMPLOYMENT SERVICE ADMINISTRATION

For an additional amount for "Limitation on grants to States for unemployment compensation and employment service administration", \$10,000,000, to be expended from the employment security administration account in the Unemployment Trust fund.

WAGE AND LABOR STANDARDS ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", \$37,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$43,000 may be transferred from the amounts herein and heretofore appropriated for "Salaries and expenses" for the current fiscal year to the fund created by section 44 of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, as amended.

44 Stat. 1444;
70 Stat. 656.
33 USC 944.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

FEDERAL CONTRACT COMPLIANCE AND CIVIL RIGHTS PROGRAM

For an additional amount for "Federal contract compliance and civil rights program, salaries and expenses", \$107,000.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

SOCIAL AND REHABILITATION SERVICE

GRANTS TO STATES FOR PUBLIC ASSISTANCE

For an additional amount for "Grants to States for public assistance," \$146,753,000.

SPECIAL INSTITUTIONS

HOWARD UNIVERSITY

CONSTRUCTION

For an additional amount for "Construction", \$7,700,000, to remain available until expended.

CHAPTER VIII

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

SENATE

CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE SENATE

INQUIRIES AND INVESTIGATIONS

For an additional amount for "Inquiries and Investigations", fiscal year 1970, \$345,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation, "Salaries, Officers and Employees", fiscal year 1970.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SALARIES, MILEAGE FOR THE MEMBERS, AND EXPENSE ALLOWANCE OF THE SPEAKER

COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS

For an additional amount for "Compensation of members", \$47,000.

SALARIES, OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

For an additional amount for "Committee on Appropriations", \$35,555.

CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE HOUSE

MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS

For an additional amount for "Miscellaneous items", \$50,000.

SPECIAL AND SELECT COMMITTEES

For an additional amount for "Special and select committees", \$100,000, to remain available until expended under the provisions of House Resolution 710, Ninety-first Congress.

GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", \$499,000.

CHAPTER IX

PUBLIC WORKS

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

COLORADO RIVER BASIN PROJECT

For an additional amount for "Colorado River Basin Project", to remain available until expended, \$6,563,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Construction and rehabilitation".

CHAPTER X

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND CONFERENCES

CONTRIBUTIONS TO INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

For an additional amount for "Contributions to international organizations", \$1,600,000.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

LEGAL ACTIVITIES AND GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

FEES AND EXPENSES OF WITNESSES

For an additional amount for "Fees and expenses of witnesses", \$500,000.

IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses, Immigration and Naturalization Service", \$892,000.

FEDERAL PRISON SYSTEM

Support of United States Prisoners

For an additional amount for "Support of United States prisoners", \$850,000.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

NINETEENTH DECENNIAL CENSUS

For an additional amount for the "Nineteenth decennial census", \$11,000,000, to remain available until December 31, 1972.

OFFICE OF FIELD SERVICES

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", \$105,000.

MARITIME ADMINISTRATION

STATE MARINE SCHOOLS

For an additional amount for "State Marine Schools", for maintenance and repair of vessels loaned by the United States for use in connection with such State marine schools, \$145,000.

THE JUDICIARY

CUSTOMS COURT

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", \$18,000.

COURTS OF APPEALS, DISTRICT COURTS, AND OTHER JUDICIAL SERVICES

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, UNITED STATES MAGISTRATES

For "Salaries and expenses, United States magistrates", \$550,000.

FEES AND EXPENSES OF COURT-APPOINTED COUNSEL

For an additional amount for "Fees and expenses of court-appointed counsel", \$1,150,000.

For an additional amount for "Fees and expenses of court-appointed counsel", \$300,000, fiscal year 1969.

FEES OF JURORS AND COMMISSIONERS

For an additional amount for "Fees of jurors and commissioners", \$500,000.

TRAVEL AND MISCELLANEOUS EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Travel and miscellaneous expenses", \$500,000.

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES COURTS

For an additional amount for "Administrative Office of the United States Courts", \$15,000.

RELATED AGENCIES

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND
WELFARE

OFFICE OF EDUCATION

CIVIL RIGHTS EDUCATION

For an additional amount for "Civil Rights Education", including not to exceed \$250,000 for salaries and expenses, \$5,000,000.

CHAPTER XI

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

COAST GUARD

RETIRED PAY

For an additional amount for "Retired pay", \$1,000,000.

RELATED AGENCY

WASHINGTON METROPOLITAN AREA TRANSIT AUTHORITY

FEDERAL CONTRIBUTION

For an additional amount for "Federal contribution", to enable the Department of Transportation to pay the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority an additional contribution for the rail rapid transit system, as authorized by the National Capital Transportation Act of 1969, (Public Law 91-143), \$82,939,000, to remain available until expended.

83 Stat. 320.
D. C. Code
1-1441 note.

CHAPTER XII

TREASURY DEPARTMENT

BUREAU OF ACCOUNTS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", \$1,300,000.

BUREAU OF THE PUBLIC DEBT

ADMINISTERING THE PUBLIC DEBT

For an additional amount for "Administering the public debt", \$3,600,000.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

(Out of Postal Fund)

TRANSPORTATION

For an additional amount for "Transportation", \$10,600,000.

RELATED AGENCIES

TAX COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", \$67,000.

CHAPTER XIII

CLAIMS AND JUDGMENTS

For payment of claims settled and determined by departments and agencies in accord with law and judgments rendered against the United States by the United States Court of Claims and United States district courts, as set forth in House Document Numbered 91-315, Ninety-first Congress, and Senate Document Numbered 91-86, Ninety-first Congress, \$23,478,461, together with such amounts as may be necessary to pay interest (as and when specified in such judgments or provided by law) and such additional sums due to increases in rates of exchange as may be necessary to pay claims in foreign currency: *Provided*, That no judgment herein appropriated for shall be paid until it shall become final and conclusive against the United States by failure of the parties to appeal or otherwise: *Provided further*, That unless otherwise specifically required by law or by judgment, payment of interest wherever appropriated for herein shall not continue for more than thirty days after the date of approval of the Act.

TITLE II

INCREASED PAY COSTS

For additional amounts for appropriations for the fiscal year 1970, for increased pay costs authorized by or pursuant to law, as follows:

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

SENATE

- "Compensation of the Vice President and Senators", \$10,835;
- "Salaries, officers and employees", \$3,634,674;
- "Office of the Legislative Counsel of the Senate", \$39,120;
- Contingent expenses of the Senate:
 - "Senate policy committees", \$47,120;
 - "Automobiles and maintenance", \$4,140;
 - "Inquiries and investigations", \$662,515; including \$23,695 for the Committee on Appropriations;
 - "Folding documents", \$4,660;
 - "Miscellaneous items", \$92,810;

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

- "Office of the Parliamentarian", \$10,865;
- "Compilation of precedents of House of Representatives", \$1,330;
- "Office of the Chaplain", \$1,805;
- "Office of the Clerk", \$100,000;
- "Office of the Sergeant at Arms", \$250,000;
- "Office of the Doorkeeper", \$120,000;
- "Office of the Postmaster", \$62,900;
- "Committee employees", \$700,000;

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Continued

Special and minority employees:

“House Democratic steering committee”, \$1,310;

“House Republican conference”, \$1,310;

“Majority leader”, \$8,135;

“Minority leader”, \$7,265;

“Majority whip”, \$5,525;

“Minority whip”, \$5,525;

“Official reporters of debates”, \$32,605;

“Official reporters to committees”, \$32,370;

“Committee on Appropriations”, \$89,445;

“Office of the legislative counsel”, \$23,400;

“Members’ clerk hire”, \$850,000;

Contingent expenses of the House:

“Government contributions”, \$760,000, and in addition such amount as may be necessary may be transferred from the appropriation for “miscellaneous items”;

“Speaker’s automobile”, \$1,500;

“Majority leader’s automobile”, \$1,500;

“Minority leader’s automobile”, \$1,500;

Joint items:

Contingent expenses of the Senate:

“Joint Economic Committee”, \$43,475;

“Joint Committee on Atomic Energy”, \$32,460;

“Joint Committee on Printing”, \$15,175;

Contingent expenses of the House:

“Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation”, \$10,065;

“Joint Committee on Defense Production”, \$10,850;

ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

Office of the Architect of the Capitol: “Salaries”, \$56,000.

Capitol buildings and grounds:

“Capitol buildings”, \$55,500;

“Capitol grounds”, \$28,200;

“Senate office buildings”, \$146,300;

“Senate garage”, \$3,400;

“House office buildings”, \$120,000;

“Capitol power plant”, \$20,800;

Library buildings and grounds: “Structural and mechanical care”, \$10,000.

BOTANIC GARDEN

“Salaries and expenses”, \$24,000;

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

“Salaries and expenses”, \$1,313,500;

Copyright Office: “Salaries and expenses”, \$274,000;

Legislative Reference Service: “Salaries and expenses”, \$414,000;

Distribution of catalog cards: “Salaries and expenses”, \$159,000, and in addition the reserve fund of \$200,000 under this head, fiscal year 1970, may be used for increased pay costs;

Books for the blind and physically handicapped: “Salaries and expenses”, \$33,000;

Organizing and microfilming the papers of the Presidents: “Salaries and expenses”, \$13,200;

“Collection and distribution of library materials (special foreign currency program)”, \$14,000;

GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

Office of Superintendent of Documents: "Salaries and expenses", \$395,400, and in addition the reserve fund of \$200,000 under this head, fiscal year 1970, may be used for pay costs;

GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

"Salaries and expenses", \$5,142,000;

THE JUDICIARY

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

"Salaries", \$194,000;

"Care of the building and grounds", \$21,700;

COURT OF CUSTOMS AND PATENT APPEALS

"Salaries and expenses", \$22,000;

CUSTOMS COURT

"Salaries and expenses", \$128,500;

COURTS OF APPEALS, DISTRICT COURTS, AND OTHER JUDICIAL SERVICES

"Salaries of supporting personnel", \$4,370,000;

"Administrative Office of the United States Courts", \$190,000, of which \$20,000 shall be derived by transfer from the appropriation for

"Expenses of referees";

"Expenses of referees", \$608,000;

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

The White House Office: "Salaries and expenses", \$310,000;

"Operating expenses, Executive Mansion", \$48,000;

BUREAU OF THE BUDGET

"Salaries and expenses", \$491,000;

COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS

"Salaries and expenses", \$50,000;

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE COUNCIL

"Salaries and expenses", \$49,000;

OFFICE OF EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS

"Salaries and expenses", \$290,000;

SPECIAL REPRESENTATIVE FOR TRADE NEGOTIATIONS

"Salaries and expenses", \$51,000;

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

PEACE CORPS

"Salaries and expenses": (Increase of \$1,651,000 in the limitation on administrative expenses);

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE: ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE

"Administrative expenses", \$3,200,000, to be derived by transfer from appropriations for "Economic assistance", fiscal year 1970;

"Administrative and other expenses": \$200,000, to be derived by transfer from appropriations for "Economic assistance", fiscal year 1970;

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH SERVICE

"Salaries and expenses", for "Research", \$8,381,000, and for "Plant and animal disease and pest control", \$5,119,000;

COOPERATIVE STATE RESEARCH SERVICE

"Payments and expenses", \$130,000;

EXTENSION SERVICE

"Cooperative extension work, payments and expenses", for "Federal Extension Service", \$250,000;

FARMER COOPERATIVE SERVICE

"Salaries and expenses", \$131,000;

SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

"Conservation operations", \$9,450,000;

"River basin surveys and investigations", \$652,000, to remain available until expended;

"Watershed planning", \$491,000, to remain available until expended;

"Watershed works of improvement", \$2,159,000, to remain available until expended;

"Flood prevention", \$815,000, to remain available until expended;

"Great plains conservation program", \$342,000, to remain available until expended;

"Resource conservation and development", \$573,000, to remain available until expended;

ECONOMIC RESEARCH SERVICE

"Salaries and expenses", \$1,142,000;

STATISTICAL REPORTING SERVICE

"Salaries and expenses", \$1,116,000;

CONSUMER AND MARKETING SERVICE

"Consumer protective, marketing, and regulatory programs", \$5,250,000;

FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL SERVICE

"Salaries and expenses", \$600,000;

COMMODITY EXCHANGE AUTHORITY

"Salaries and expenses", \$170,000;

AGRICULTURAL STABILIZATION AND CONSERVATION SERVICE

"Expenses, Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service", \$7,899,000, of which \$600,000 shall be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Conservation reserve program", fiscal year 1970, and \$1,299,000 from the Commodity Credit Corporation Fund;

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

"Salaries and expenses", \$1,022,000;

PACKERS AND STOCKYARDS ADMINISTRATION

"Salaries and expenses", \$154,000;

OFFICE OF THE GENERAL COUNSEL

"Salaries and expenses", \$427,000;

OFFICE OF INFORMATION

"Salaries and expenses", \$150,000;

NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL LIBRARY

"Salaries and expenses", \$175,000;

OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT SERVICES

"Salaries and expenses", \$237,000;

GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

"Salaries and expenses", \$425,000;

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

"Salaries and expenses", \$1,075,000;

FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION

"Salaries and expenses", \$5,200,000;

FOREST SERVICE

"Forest protection and utilization", \$10,266,000;

FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE CORPORATION

"Administrative and operating expenses", \$691,000, which may be paid from premium income;

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

"Salaries and expenses", \$604,000;

OFFICE OF BUSINESS ECONOMICS

"Salaries and expenses", \$238,000;

BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

"Salaries and expenses", \$1,141,000;

"Nineteenth decennial census", \$6,722,000, to remain available until December 31, 1972;

"1967 economic censuses", \$282,000, to remain available until December 31, 1970;

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION

"Operations and administration", \$1,121,000;

BUSINESS AND DEFENSE SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

"Salaries and expenses", \$505,000;

INTERNATIONAL ACTIVITIES

"Salaries and expenses", \$835,000;

"Export control", \$446,000;

OFFICE OF FIELD SERVICES

"Salaries and expenses", \$389,000;

MINORITY BUSINESS ENTERPRISE

"Salaries and expenses", \$94,000;

FOREIGN DIRECT INVESTMENT CONTROL

"Salaries and expenses", \$100,000;

ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCE SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

"Salaries and expenses", \$8,040,000;

"Research and development", \$1,239,000, to remain available until expended;

"Satellite operations", \$421,000, to remain available until expended;

PATENT OFFICE

"Salaries and expenses", \$3,135,000;

NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS

"Research and technical services", \$2,187,000;

MARITIME ADMINISTRATION

"Salaries and expenses", for administrative expenses, \$746,000;

"Maritime training", \$204,000;

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—MILITARY

MILITARY PERSONNEL

“Military personnel, Army”, \$538,000,000;
“Military personnel, Navy”, \$360,000,000;
“Military personnel, Marine Corps”, \$123,300,000;
“Military personnel, Air Force”, \$502,500,000;
“Reserve personnel, Army”, \$22,900,000;
“Reserve personnel, Navy”, \$6,000,000;
“Reserve personnel, Marine Corps”, \$4,000,000;
“National Guard personnel, Army”, \$33,500,000;
“National Guard personnel, Air Force”, \$10,000,000;

RETIRED MILITARY PERSONNEL

“Retired pay, Defense”, \$25,000,000;

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

“Operation and maintenance, Army”, \$196,480,000;
“Operation and maintenance, Navy”, \$157,800,000;
“Operation and maintenance, Marine Corps”, \$7,000,000;
“Operation and maintenance, Air Force”, \$84,200,000;
“Operation and maintenance, Defense agencies”, \$70,400,000;
“Operation and maintenance, Army National Guard”, \$13,800,000;
“Operation and maintenance, Air National Guard”, \$12,250,000;
“Court of Military Appeals”, \$70,000;

CIVIL DEFENSE

“Operation and maintenance”, \$850,000;

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

“Operation and maintenance, general”, \$6,905,000;
“General expenses”, \$2,000,000;

RYUKYU ISLANDS, ARMY

“Administration”, \$200,000;

U.S. SOLDIERS' HOME

“Operation and maintenance”, \$296,000;

THE PANAMA CANAL

CANAL ZONE GOVERNMENT

“Operating expenses”, \$963,000;

PANAMA CANAL COMPANY

“Limitation on general and administrative expenses”, (Increase of \$605,000 in the limitation on general and administrative expenses);

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

CONSUMER PROTECTION AND ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH SERVICE

"Food and drug control", \$2,294,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Health services research and development", fiscal year 1970;

"Air pollution control", \$1,062,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Comprehensive health planning and services", fiscal year 1970;

"Environmental control", \$757,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Regional medical programs", fiscal year 1970;

"Office of the Administrator, salaries and expenses", \$354,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases", fiscal year 1970;

HEALTH SERVICES AND MENTAL HEALTH ADMINISTRATION

"Mental health", \$358,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases", fiscal year 1970;

"Saint Elizabeths Hospital", \$2,519,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Stroke", fiscal year 1970;

"Communicable diseases", \$2,446,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Maternal and child health and welfare", fiscal year 1970;

"Hospital construction", \$208,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "National Institute of Arthritis and Metabolic Diseases", fiscal year 1970;

"Patient care and special health services", \$5,241,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "National Institute of Arthritis and Metabolic Diseases", fiscal year 1970;

"National health statistics", \$329,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "National Institute of Arthritis and Metabolic Diseases", fiscal year 1970;

"Indian health services", \$4,464,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "National Institute of General Medical Sciences", fiscal year 1970;

"Office of the Administrator, salaries and expenses", \$691,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Stroke", fiscal year 1970;

NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

"Office of the Director, Salaries and expenses", \$218,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "National Institute of General Medical Sciences", fiscal year 1970;

OFFICE OF EDUCATION

"School assistance in federally affected areas", \$14,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Research and training, Office of Education", fiscal year 1970;

"Libraries and community services", \$300,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Research and training, Office of Education", fiscal year 1970;

"Salaries and expenses", \$2,528,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Research and training, Office of Education", fiscal year 1970;

SOCIAL AND REHABILITATION SERVICE

"Salaries and expenses", \$2,496,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases", fiscal year 1970;

"Assistance to refugees in the United States", \$90,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Stroke", fiscal year 1970;

SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

"Limitation on salaries and expenses (trust fund)" (Increase of \$21,276,000 in the limitation on "Salaries and expenses");

SPECIAL INSTITUTIONS

"Model Secondary School for the Deaf, salaries and expenses", \$12,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Stroke", fiscal year 1970;

"Gallaudet College, salaries and expenses", \$162,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Stroke", fiscal year 1970;

"Howard University, salaries and expenses", \$664,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Comprehensive health planning and services", fiscal year 1970;

"Freedmen's Hospital", \$766,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "comprehensive health planning and services", fiscal year 1970;

DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT

"Office of the Secretary, salaries and expenses", \$451,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Comprehensive health planning and services", fiscal year 1970;

"Office for Civil Rights, salaries and expenses", \$496,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Comprehensive health planning and services", fiscal year 1970;

"Office of Community and Field Services, salaries and expenses", \$607,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Comprehensive health planning and services", fiscal year 1970;

"Office of the Comptroller, salaries and expenses", \$1,018,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Comprehensive health planning and services", fiscal year 1970;

"Office of the Administrator, salaries and expenses", \$476,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Comprehensive health planning and services", fiscal year 1970;

"Surplus property utilization", \$107,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Comprehensive health planning and services", fiscal year 1970;

"Office of the General Counsel, salaries and expenses", \$337,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Comprehensive health planning and services", fiscal year 1970;

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

RENEWAL AND HOUSING ASSISTANCE

"Salaries and expenses", \$2,508,000;

METROPOLITAN DEVELOPMENT

"Salaries and expenses", \$480,700;

MODEL CITIES AND GOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

"Salaries and expenses", \$27,600, together with not to exceed \$400,900, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Model cities programs" fiscal year 1970;

FEDERAL INSURANCE ADMINISTRATION

"Flood insurance", \$28,500;

FAIR HOUSING AND EQUAL OPPORTUNITY

"Fair housing and equal opportunity", \$391,400;

DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT

"General administration", \$559,500;

"Regional management and services", \$655,000;

"Limitation on administrative expenses, college housing loans" (Increase of \$75,000 in the limitation on administrative expenses);

"Limitation on administrative expenses, public facility loans" (Increase of \$55,000 in the limitation on administrative expenses);

"Limitation on administrative expenses, revolving fund (liquidating programs)" (Increase of \$6,700 in the limitation on administrative expenses);

"Limitation on administrative and nonadministrative expenses, Federal housing administration" (Increase of \$450,000 in the limitation on administrative expenses and increase of \$5,175,000 in the limitation on nonadministrative expenses);

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

"Management of lands and resources", \$3,498,000;

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

"Education and welfare services", \$9,799,000;

"Resources management", \$4,378,000;

"General administrative expenses", \$500,000;

BUREAU OF OUTDOOR RECREATION

"Salaries and expenses", \$200,000;

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

"Surveys, investigations, and research", \$3,310,000;

BUREAU OF MINES

"Conservation and development of mineral resources", \$3,164,000;
"Health and safety", \$1,120,000;
"General administrative expenses", \$152,000;

OFFICE OF OIL AND GAS

"Salaries and expenses", \$91,000;

BUREAU OF COMMERCIAL FISHERIES

"Management and investigations of resources", \$936,000;
"Federal aid for commercial fisheries research and development",
\$13,000;
"Anadromous and Great Lakes fisheries conservation", \$11,000;
"General administrative expenses", \$131,000;
"Administration of Pribilof Islands", \$120,000, to be derived from
the Pribilof Islands fund;
"Limitation on administrative expenses, fisheries loan fund" (In-
crease of \$25,000 in the limitation on administrative expenses);

BUREAU OF SPORT FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE

"Management and investigations of resources", \$3,363,000;
"General administrative expenses", \$176,000;
"Anadromous and Great Lakes fisheries conservation", \$17,000;

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

"Management and protection", \$3,681,000;
"Maintenance and rehabilitation of physical facilities", \$1,346,000;
"General administrative expenses", \$263,000;
"Preservation of historic properties", \$40,000;

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

"General investigations", \$900,000;
"Operation and maintenance", \$1,870,000;
"General administrative expenses", \$970,000;

BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION

"Operation and maintenance", \$800,000;

SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

"Operation and maintenance", \$155,000;

OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR

"Salaries and expenses", \$374,000;

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

"Salaries and expenses", \$702,000;

OFFICE OF WATER RESOURCES RESEARCH

"Salaries and expenses", \$52,000;

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

LEGAL ACTIVITIES AND GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

- "Salaries and expenses, general administration", \$634,000;
- "Salaries and expenses, general legal activities", \$2,264,000;
- "Salaries and expenses, Antitrust Division", \$769,000;
- "Salaries and expenses, United States attorneys and marshals", \$3,824,000;
- "Salaries and expenses, Community Relations Service", \$230,000;

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

- "Salaries and expenses", \$17,455,000;

IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE

- "Salaries and expenses", \$7,452,000;

FEDERAL PRISON SYSTEM

- "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Prisons", \$5,109,000;

FEDERAL PRISON INDUSTRIES, INCORPORATED

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE AND VOCATIONAL TRAINING EXPENSES,
FEDERAL PRISON INDUSTRIES, INCORPORATED

In addition to the amount heretofore made available under this heading for administrative expenses, \$55,000 shall be available for such expenses during the current fiscal year.

BUREAU OF NARCOTICS AND DANGEROUS DRUGS

- "Salaries and expenses", \$1,530,000;

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

MANPOWER ADMINISTRATION

"Manpower development and training activities", \$145,000, of which \$100,000 shall be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Office of Manpower Administrator, salaries and expenses", fiscal year 1970;

"Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training, salaries and expenses", \$343,000;

"Bureau of Employment Security, salaries and expenses", \$1,408,000, to be expended from the Employment Security Administration account in the Unemployment Trust Fund;

LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS

"Labor-Management Services Administration, salaries and expenses", \$805,000;

WAGE AND LABOR STANDARDS

"Wage and Labor Standards Administration, salaries and expenses", \$713,000;

"Wage and Hour Division, salaries and expenses", \$1,440,000;

BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS

"Salaries and expenses", \$1,693,000;

BUREAU OF INTERNATIONAL LABOR AFFAIRS

"Salaries and expenses", \$130,000;

OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR

"Salaries and expenses", \$438,000; and, in addition, \$13,000 to be derived from the Employment Security Administration account, Unemployment Trust Fund;

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

"Salaries and expenses", \$515,000; and, in addition, \$36,000 to be derived from the Employment Security Administration account, Unemployment Trust Fund;

OFFICE OF FEDERAL CONTRACT COMPLIANCE AND CIVIL RIGHTS
PROGRAM

"Salaries and expenses", \$56,000; and, in addition, \$53,000 to be derived from the Employment Security Administration account, Unemployment Trust Fund;

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

(OUT OF THE POSTAL FUND)

"Administration and regional operation"; \$10,715,000;

"Research, development, and engineering", \$898,000; to remain available until expended;

"Operations", \$261,956,000;

"Supplies and services", \$215,000;

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

ADMINISTRATION OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS

"Salaries and expenses," \$13,400,000;

"Acquisition, operation, and maintenance of buildings abroad," \$177,000, to remain available until expended;

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND CONFERENCE

"Missions to international organizations," \$340,000;

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSIONS

International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico:

"Salaries and expenses," \$81,000;

"Operation and maintenance," \$175,000;

"American sections, international commissions," \$42,000;

"International fisheries commissions," \$56,000;

EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE

"Mutual educational and cultural exchange activities," \$700,000;

OTHER

"Migration and refugee assistance," \$60,000;

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

"Salaries and expenses", \$720,000;

COAST GUARD

"Operating expenses", \$21,675,000;

"Reserve training", \$1,000,000;

FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION

"Operations", \$58,597,000;

"Operation and maintenance, National Capital airports", \$400,000;

FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION

"Office of the Administrator, salaries and expenses", \$132,000 (together with an increase of \$941,000 in the amount to be transferred from the appropriation for "Federal-aid Highways trust fund");

"Traffic and highway safety", \$600,000;

"Motor carrier safety", \$173,000;

"Bureau of Public Roads, limitation on general expenses" (Increase of \$3,081,000 in the limitation on administrative expenses to be paid from the appropriation for the "Federal-aid highways trust fund");

FEDERAL RAILROAD ADMINISTRATION

"Office of the Administrator, salaries and expenses", \$85,000;

"Bureau of Railroad Safety", \$270,000;

URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ADMINISTRATION

"Salaries and expenses", \$100,000;

SAINT LAWRENCE SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

"Limitation on administrative expenses" (Increase of \$52,000 in the limitation on administrative expenses);

NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD

"Salaries and expenses", \$350,000;

TREASURY DEPARTMENT

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

"Salaries and expenses", \$628,000;

BUREAU OF ACCOUNTS

"Salaries and expenses", \$400,000;

BUREAU OF CUSTOMS

"Salaries and expenses", \$8,830,000;

BUREAU OF THE MINT

"Salaries and expenses", \$500,000;

BUREAU OF THE PUBLIC DEBT

"Administering the public debt", \$1,444,000;

INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE

"Salaries and expenses", \$1,846,000;

"Revenue accounting and processing", \$11,920,000;

"Compliance", \$46,291,000;

OFFICE OF THE TREASURER

"Salaries and expenses", \$523,000;

UNITED STATES SECRET SERVICE

"Salaries and expenses", \$1,940,000: *Provided*, That \$200,000 of this appropriation shall be available only upon enactment into law of H.R. 17138, Ninety-first Congress, or similar legislation;

Ante, p. 354.

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

"Operating expenses", \$5,000,000;

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

"Operating expenses, Public Buildings Service", \$7,222,000;

"Operating expenses, Federal Supply Service", \$4,431,000;

"Operating expenses, National Archives and Records Service", \$1,635,000;

"Operating expenses, Transportation and Communications Service", \$528,000;

"Operating expenses, Property Management and Disposal Service", \$796,000;

"Salaries and expenses, Office of Administrator", \$71,000;

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE
ADMINISTRATION

"Research and program management", \$38,000,000;

VETERANS ADMINISTRATION

"Medical and prosthetic research", \$2,983,000;

"Medical administration and miscellaneous operating expenses", \$955,000;

"General operating expenses", \$15,835,000;

OTHER INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

AMERICAN BATTLE MONUMENTS COMMISSION

"Salaries and expenses", \$77,000;

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

"Salaries and expenses", \$900,000;

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

"Salaries and expenses", \$2,354,000;

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION

"Salaries and expenses", \$900,000;

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF THE UNITED STATES

"Limitation on administrative expenses" (Increase of \$400,000 in the limitation on administrative expenses);

FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

"Limitation on administrative expenses" (Increase of \$215,000 in the limitation on administrative expenses);

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

"Salaries and expenses", \$1,700,000;

FEDERAL FIELD COMMITTEE FOR DEVELOPMENT
PLANNING IN ALASKA

"Salaries and expenses", \$21,000;

FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

"Limitation on administrative and nonadministrative expenses, Federal Home Loan Bank Board" (Increase of \$412,000 in the limitation on administrative expenses, and increase of \$325,000 in the limitation on nonadministrative expenses);

"Limitation on administrative expenses, Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation" (Increase of \$24,000 in the limitation on administrative expenses);

FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION

"Salaries and expenses", \$228,000;

FEDERAL MEDIATION AND CONCILIATION SERVICE

"Salaries and expenses", \$615,000;

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

"Salaries and expenses", \$1,300,000;

FEDERAL RADIATION COUNCIL

"Salaries and expenses", \$8,000;

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

"Salaries and expenses", \$1,000,000;

FOREIGN CLAIMS SETTLEMENT COMMISSION

"Salaries and expenses", \$56,000;

HISTORICAL AND MEMORIAL COMMISSIONS

American Revolution Bicentennial Commission:

"Salaries and expenses", \$10,000;

INTER-AGENCY COMMITTEE ON MEXICAN-AMERICAN AFFAIRS

"Salaries and expenses", \$27,000;

INTERGOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES

ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

"Salaries and expenses", \$45,000;

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION

"Salaries and expenses", \$42,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Appalachian regional development programs";

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

"Salaries and expenses", \$1,900,000;

NATIONAL CAPITAL PLANNING COMMISSION

"Salaries and expenses", \$25,000;

NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES

"Salaries and expenses", \$120,000;

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

"Salaries and expenses", \$1,642,000;

NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

"Salaries and expenses", \$127,000;

PRESIDENT'S COMMITTEE ON CONSUMER INTERESTS

"Salaries and expenses", \$10,000;

RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

"Limitation on salaries and expenses" (Increase of \$990,000 in the limitation on "Salaries and expenses");

RENEGOTIATION BOARD

"Salaries and expenses", \$110,000;

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

"Salaries and expenses", \$1,000,000;

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

"Salaries and expenses", \$3,971,000, of which \$3,163,000 shall be derived by transfer from the "Business loan and investment fund", from the "Disaster loan fund", and from the "Lease guarantees revolving fund";

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

"Salaries and expenses", \$1,331,000;
"Salaries and expenses, National Gallery of Art," \$191,000;

SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL BOARD

"Salaries and expenses", \$57,000;

TARIFF COMMISSION

"Salaries and expenses", \$239,000;

TAX COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

"Salaries and expenses", \$140,000;

UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY

"Salaries and expenses", \$6,883,000;
"Special international exhibitions", \$183,000 to remain available until expended;

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

(OUT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FUNDS)

"General operating expenses", \$2,229,000;
"Public safety", \$2,324,000;
"Education", \$966,000;
"Parks and recreation", \$899,000;
"Health and welfare", \$4,624,000;
"Highways and traffic", \$600,000;
"Sanitary engineering", \$1,905,000.

DIVISION OF EXPENSES

The sums appropriated in this title for the District of Columbia shall be paid as follows: \$12,191,000 from the general fund; \$535,000 from the highway fund (regular); \$14,000 from the highway fund (parking); \$468,000 from the water fund; and \$339,000 from the sanitary sewage works fund.

TITLE III

INCREASED PAY COSTS—FEDERAL EMPLOYEES
SALARY ACT OF 1970

SEC. 301. For costs in the fiscal year 1970 of pay increases granted by or pursuant to the Federal Employees Salary Act of 1970 and the Act of December 16, 1967 (81 Stat. 649), for any branch of the Federal Government or the municipal government of the District of Columbia, to be available immediately, such amounts as may be necessary, to be determined as hereinafter provided in this title, but no appropriation, fund, limitation, or authorization may be increased

Ante, p. 195.
35 F. R. 6247,
6251.
37 USC 203
and notes.

pursuant to the provisions of this title in an amount in excess of the cost to such appropriation, fund, limitation, or authorization of increased compensation pursuant to such statutes.

SEC. 302. Any officer having administrative control of an appropriation, fund, limitation, or authorization properly chargeable with the costs in the fiscal year 1970 of pay increases granted by or pursuant to the Federal Employees Salary Act of 1970 and the Act of December 16, 1967 (81 Stat. 649), is authorized to transfer thereto, from the unobligated balance of any other appropriation, fund, or authorization under his administrative control and expiring for obligation on June 30, 1970, such amounts as may be necessary for meeting such costs.

SEC. 303. Whenever any officer referred to in section 304 of this title shall determine that he has exhausted the possibilities of meeting the cost of pay increases through the use of transfers as authorized by said section, he shall certify the additional amount required to meet such costs for each appropriation, fund, limitation, or authorization under his administrative control, and the amounts so certified shall be added to the pertinent appropriation, fund, limitation, or authorization for the fiscal year 1970: *Provided*, That any transfer under the authority of section 302 or any certification made under the authority of this section by an officer in or under the executive branch of the Federal Government shall be valid only when approved by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

SEC. 304. For the purposes of the transfers and certifications authorized by sections 302 and 303 of this title, the following officers shall be deemed to have administrative control of appropriations, funds, limitations, or authorizations available within their respective organizational units—

(a) For the legislative branch:

The Clerk of the House;
The Secretary of the Senate;
The Librarian of Congress;
The Architect of the Capitol;
The Public Printer;
The Comptroller General of the United States;
The Chief Judge of the United States Tax Court;
The chairman of any commission in or under the legislative branch.

(b) For the Judiciary:

The Administrative Officer of the United States Courts.

(c) For the executive branch:

The head of each department, agency, or corporation in or under the executive branch.

(d) For the municipal government of the District of Columbia:

The Commissioner of the District of Columbia.

SEC. 305. Obligations or expenditures incurred for costs in the fiscal year 1970 of pay increases granted by or pursuant to the Federal Employees Salary Act of 1970 and the Act of December 16, 1967 (81 Stat. 649), shall not be regarded or reported as violations of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665).

SEC. 306. (a) Amounts made available by this title shall be derived from the same source as the appropriation, fund, limitation, or authorization to which such amounts are added.

(b) Appropriations made by, and transfers made pursuant to, this title shall be recorded on the books of the Government as of June 30, 1970: *Provided*, That no appropriation made by this title shall be warranted, and no transfer authorized by this title shall be made, after August 15, 1970.

Funds, transfer.

Ante, p. 195.
35 F. R. 6247,
6251.
37 USC 203 and
notes.

Additional
amounts, cer-
tification.

Administrative
officers.

Report to
Bureau of the
Budget and
Congress.

(c) A complete report of the appropriations and transfers made by or pursuant to this title shall be made, not later than September 15, 1970, by the officers described in section 304, to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, who shall compile and transmit to the Congress a consolidated report not later than October 15, 1970.

TITLE IV

LIMITATION ON FISCAL YEAR 1970 BUDGET OUTLAYS

83 Stat. 82.

Reports to
President and
Congress.

Presidential
notifications
to Congress.

SEC. 401. (a) Notwithstanding the provisions of title IV of the Second Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1969, expenditures and net lending (budget outlays) of the Federal Government during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, shall not exceed \$197,885,000,000: *Provided*, That whenever action, or inaction, by the Congress on requests for appropriations and other budgetary proposals varies from the President's recommendations with respect to the fiscal year 1970, as reflected in the Budget for 1971 (H. Doc. 91-240, part 1), the Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall report to the President and to the Congress his estimate of the effect of such action or inaction on budget outlays, and the limitation set forth herein shall be correspondingly adjusted: *Provided further*, That the Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall report to the President and to the Congress his estimate of the effect on budget outlays of other actions by the Congress (whether initiated by the President or the Congress) and the limitation set forth herein shall be correspondingly adjusted: *Provided further*, That in the event the President shall estimate and determine that total budget outlays cannot be held within the overall limitation provided herein, he may, after notification in writing to the Congress stating his reasons therefor, adjust the amount by not more than one-half of 1 percent thereof.

(b) (1) In the event the President shall estimate and determine that budget outlays during the fiscal year 1970 for the following items (the expenditures for which arise under appropriations or other authority not requiring annual action by the Congress) appearing on page 49 of the Budget for 1971, namely:

- (i) items designated "Social security, medicare, and other social insurance trust funds";
- (ii) the item "National service life insurance (trust fund)";
- (iii) the item "Interest"; and
- (iv) the item "Farm price supports (Commodity Credit Corporation)"

will exceed the estimates included for such items in the Budget for 1971, the President may, after notification in writing to the Congress stating his reasons therefor, adjust accordingly the amount of the overall limitation provided in subsection (a).

(2) In the event the President shall estimate and determine that receipts (credited against budget outlays) during the fiscal year 1970 derived from:

- (i) sales of financial assets of programs administered by the Farmers Home Administration, Export-Import Bank, agencies of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and the Veterans' Administration; and

(ii) leases of lands on the Outer Continental Shelf; will be less than the estimates included for such items in the Budget for 1971, the President may, after notification in writing to the Congress stating his reasons therefor, adjust accordingly the amount of the overall limitation provided in subsection (a).

(3) The aggregate amount of the adjustments made pursuant to paragraphs (1) and (2) of this subsection shall not exceed \$1,000,000,000.

(c) The Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall make a preliminary report (by July 31, 1970) and a final report (by December 31, 1970) to the President and the Congress on the operation of this section.

Reports to
President and
Congress.

TITLE V

LIMITATION ON FISCAL YEAR 1971 BUDGET OUTLAYS

SEC. 501. (a) Expenditures and net lending (budget outlays) of the Federal Government during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, shall not exceed \$200,771,000,000: *Provided*, That whenever action, or inaction, by the Congress on requests for appropriations and other budgetary proposals varies from the President's recommendations reflected in the Budget for 1971 (H. Doc. 91-240, part 1), the Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall report to the President and to the Congress his estimate of the effect of such action or inaction on budget outlays, and the limitation set forth herein shall be correspondingly adjusted: *Provided further*, That the Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall report to the President and to the Congress his estimate of the effect on budget outlays of other actions by the Congress whether initiated by the President or the Congress) and the limitation set forth herein shall be correspondingly adjusted, and reports, so far as practicable, shall indicate whether such other actions were initiated by the President or by the Congress.

Reports to
President and
Congress.

(b) (1) In the event the President shall estimate and determine that budget outlays during the fiscal year 1971 for the following items (the expenditures for which arise under appropriations or other authority not requiring annual action by the Congress) appearing on page 49 of the Budget for 1971, namely:

(i) items designated "Social security, medicare, and other social insurance trust funds";

(ii) the item "National service life insurance (trust fund)";

(iii) the item "Interest"; and

(iv) the item "Farm price supports (Commodity Credit Corporation)";

will exceed the estimates included for such items in the Budget for 1971, the President may, after notification in writing to the Congress stating his reasons therefor, adjust accordingly the amount of the overall limitation provided in subsection (a).

Presidential
notifications
to Congress.

(2) In the event the President shall estimate and determine that receipts (credited against budget outlays) during the fiscal year 1971 derived from:

(i) sales of financial assets of programs administered by the Farmers Home Administration, Export-Import Bank, agencies of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and the Veterans' Administration; and

(ii) leases of lands on the Outer Continental Shelf;

will be less than the estimates included for such items in the Budget for 1971, the President may, after notification in writing to the Congress stating his reasons therefor, adjust accordingly the amount of the overall limitation provided in subsection (a).

(3) The aggregate amount of the adjustments made pursuant to paragraphs (1) and (2) of this subsection shall not exceed \$4,500,000,000.

(c) The Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall report periodically to the President and to the Congress on the operation of this sec-

Reports to
Congress.

tion. Such reports shall be made at the end of each calendar month during the second session of the Ninety-first Congress and at the end of each calendar quarter thereafter.

TITLE VI

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 601. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year unless expressly so provided therein.

Personal
service ex-
penditures,
increase.

SEC. 602. Except where specifically increased or decreased elsewhere in this Act, the restrictions contained within appropriations, or provisions affecting appropriations or other funds, available during the fiscal year 1970, limiting the amounts which may be expended for personal services, or for purposes involving personal services, or amounts which may be transferred between appropriations or authorizations available for or involving such services, are hereby increased to the extent necessary to meet increased pay costs authorized by or pursuant to law.

SEC. 603. None of the funds contained in this Act available to the Inter-American Bank shall be used directly or indirectly as grants or loans to officers or members of the staff of the Inter-American Bank.

SEC. 604. Funds appropriated, or otherwise made available, by this Act for the fiscal year 1970, shall remain available for obligation until July 1, 1970, or for five days after the date of approval of this Act, whichever is later, unless a longer period is specifically provided: *Provided*, That all obligations incurred in anticipation of such appropriations and authority for the fiscal year 1970 as well as those for longer periods as set forth herein are hereby ratified and confirmed if in accordance with the terms hereof.

Approved July 6, 1970.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY:

HOUSE REPORTS: No. 91-1033 (Comm. on Appropriations) and No. 91-1227 (Comm. of Conference).

SENATE REPORT No. 91-917 (Comm. on Appropriations).

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Vol. 116 (1970):

May 7, considered and passed House.

June 22, considered and passed Senate, amended.

June 25, House agreed to conference report.

June 29, Senate agreed to conference report.

○